

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of 47 citizens of West Philadelphia, Pa., to exclude liquor advertisements from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Liquor Dealers' Protective Association of Illinois against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Variety Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., against abandonment of the pneumatic mail-tube service in Chicago; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John H. Ganger & Co., of Chicago, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Theodore Gilbert, of Hartford, Conn., favoring bill for maimed soldiers' pensions, House bill 14428; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of American Association of State Highway Officials, favoring completion of the topographic map of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Brotherhood of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., favoring bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of terminal railway post-office clerks relative to classification of terminal railway post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. IGOE: Petitions of St. Louis business houses, urging reduction in postal rates on first-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of John Garver and 11 other post-office employees of Mount Pleasant, Mich., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: Petition of postal employees of Clinton, Cal., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of Caradine Harvest Hat Co., Bradley-Steach Machine Co., Meyer-Schmid Grocery Co., St. Louis Sticker Co., and Silver Laundry Co., all of St. Louis, Mo., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Workingmen's Mutual Aid Association of St. Louis, Mo., favoring embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of J. C. Staples, of Philadelphia, and Rev. James Henry Darlington, of Harrisburg, both in the State of Pennsylvania, for 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Hoehn, secretary of the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the District of Columbia prohibition bill, also national prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Trades Union Liberty League of Pittsburgh, Pa., against prohibition in the District of Columbia and national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 16848, granting an increase of pension to James K. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of various employees of the customs service at Rouses Point, N. Y., urging that all employees of that service be given an increase of salary at the present session of Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of General Crook Post, No. 33, Grand Army of the Republic, Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring passage of the volunteer officers' retired bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 2, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast in Thy providence brought us once more to the place of our reckoning of time. It is a place of holy memories and of divine inspiration. We turn our faces toward the coming days with high hopes and with confidence in the final supremacy of the great national ideals. The ship of state turns its way upon a stormy sea. A hundred million spirits depend upon the leadership of the men whom Thou hast called into places of authority and power. Give to them spiritual vision and hearts to see God, leading us on in the great conquests of peace. Grant, we pray, that this year we may achieve a nation's highest ideal and ambition in the establishment of peace and good will among men. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (Senator WILLARD SAULSBURY) took the chair.

JOSEPH E. RANDELL, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 22, 1916, was read and approved.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Much has been said recently about what has been called a "leak" from official sources with respect to certain important official acts, which "leak," it is said, affected the stock market in New York. I need not say more about that, for the reason that everyone within my hearing is familiar with the newspaper gabble about the subject referred to.

My attention has been called to an article appearing in the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier of December 21 of the year just ended. This article is apparently in the form of a dispatch from New York, and I would think from its printed appearance that it was sent out by some news agency, telling about the break in the stock market, the losses, and the profits of speculation. I read the closing paragraph of this dispatch, which is as follows:

Total sales up to 1 o'clock December 21 approximated 2,000,000 shares, indicating that the full day's trading would probably exceed all records. Of this amount, United States Senator STONE alone contributed 574,900 shares.

I do not think I would dignify this statement by any notice whatever except for the fact that so much has been said and is being said about this affair. The article is headed "Market in a panic," and if this dispatch be true, inasmuch, according to this dispatch, I was either selling or buying about one-fourth of all the stock dealt in on that day of panic, I must have had a great deal to do with the panic.

I take it, Senators, that it is needless to say, and yet I feel I ought to say, not in my defense but as emphasizing an example of newspaper mendacity or news agency mendacity, that I did not buy or sell one penny's worth of stock of any kind. The story as to me is just simply an unvarnished falsehood.

I do not care to say more about that; what I have said is enough. And yet I crave permission to add that these wild, panicky stock speculation stories do concern me at least in two ways: First, if it be true that any public official has used any confidential or secret information, as has been alleged, to further his interests in speculation on the stock markets, he is an unspeakable scoundrel. If any man in legislative life did a thing like that, which I am bound to believe impossible; if any Senator did a thing like that, which still more I believe to be impossible, he ought to be dismissed from the body he dishonors.

Mr. President, I do not know whether there is any foundation for these sensational stories; I mean I know nothing of the facts in this particular instance—only I believe, for the most part, the charges are lies. I do know that some things have occurred in the State Department that ought not to have been possible. I do know that confidential communications made years ago by foreign Governments to the State Department, communications that would never have been made, which could not have been made, except in the faith that our State Department would hold them sacred, have by some means found their way into the hands of men not authorized to receive them. I am not the only Senator present who knows that; yet I think I might take this occasion to refer to it. The things to which I refer did not concern stock markets; they could not have affected stock values or speculations; but they did concern the honor of the Nation. This was treachery on the part of some departmental officials. Such things could have happened only through the infidelity of employees in the department. I fear that this betrayal of public confidence is in some way traceable to our wonderful civil service. Let me say, without a moment's halting, if I could have my way I would have every administration put its own trusted men—men of its own choosing—in every really responsible place. Do not understand me as saying that the civil service should be swept off the statute books; but there are men now holding important and confidential relations to the State Department, and no doubt in other departments, who have no reason, except as they individually may be honest men and true, to be faithful to their chiefs. Many of them, I am sure, would be happy to see the administration in which they serve a failure. I think those who hold positions of control and of dominating influence—the chiefs of divisions and up—should be in hearty sympathy with the administration under which they serve. Otherwise you have unfriendly captains on guard. That is all I care to say about that, but I think this an opportune occasion to impress the importance of this view.

The second view I have of this stock-market business is this, that I do not care the snap of my fingers about whether the



stock gamblers in Wall Street lose or win. I am deeply concerned to know that no public official has betrayed a trust or profited by speculations. But, so far as the Lawson type is concerned, I do not care whether they win or lose; it is a gamble in which I feel no interest. I hope we have come to a period in our public life—our progressive public life—when the Government of the United States does not have to wait upon the stock exchange of New York or any exchange anywhere to determine when it shall communicate with foreign Governments or what it shall say to foreign Governments. I hope we have reached a time when the President can say what he pleases to foreign Governments, or say what he pleases to the Congress, without waiting with bated breath to find out whether his utterance may have some effect on Wall Street speculations. So far as I am concerned, these gamblers may take care of themselves and the Government take care of itself without regard to them, provided always, I say again, that no public official in any department of the Government is guilty of wrongdoing.

Mr. President, I had thought to say something about this Lawson talk. Is it worth while to speak of it? However, I will say this much, that all this Lawson talk disgusts me. It disgusts me that any man in public life would give a moment of serious thought or attention to such talk from such a source, unless he should know that it would lead to the exposure and disgrace of an undeserving public servant; but he should be sure of that. If there is anything that I despise, it is the sensational fakir who is always advertising himself by talking about public bodies and public men. If you were to believe this fellow Lawson, you would suppose there were no honest men in the Senate or in the House or in any position in public life. He makes bold to say that Senators and Representatives are ready to suppress something for fear that if an honest investigation were entered upon there would not be next day a quorum in either House. Think of that, Mr. President! that a creature of this low type, this abominable and contemptible human thing—another and perhaps worse type than the imprisoned Wolf of Wall Street—should make a statement of this character and have it considered by Members of Congress and exploited column after column in the newspapers of the country. It is shameful!

To say nothing of Congressmen, I am sorry that our great newspapers—I am not now speaking of the gentlemen of the press up there, for they have had little to do with it; nothing, so far as I know; but I speak of the papers they represent—I am sorry that great papers should give voice to the braying of this ass and exploit his libels against the Government through their columns. I despise the one; I am sorry about the other.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I know nothing about the article to which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has referred. I accept, of course, implicitly the statement that he has made. Indeed, it would not have required any statement from him to have convinced me that the charge or suggestion made had no foundation.

I feel, however, that I ought to say this: The newspaper in which the article occurs is one of the most reputable publications of which I know. Its editor and its owners are high-minded, honorable men, and they would not intentionally publish a falsehood about any man. It is certain to me that they have been misled through some agency or correspondent. I say this in their behalf lest it should be thought that the article emanates from a cheap or sensational newspaper.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, has the Senator from Iowa the article to which he refers?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not.

Mr. BORAH. May I see the article to which the Senator from Missouri has referred?

Mr. STONE. I will hand it to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I take it that this article is an Associated Press dispatch, and, in my judgment, all this is due to a mistake somewhere in transmission. Being an Associated Press dispatch it would have appeared in hundreds of newspapers if we are not to assume an error as to this paper. This undoubtedly refers to United States Steel instead of United States Senator STONE. [Laughter.] I think it would be found upon examination that it was not intended to use Senator STONE's name at all, but that it was merely a mistake in the transmission of the telegram—either in the reading in the beginning or the reading when it was taken from the dispatch or in proof reading. If you will look up other similar dispatches, you will find it says United States Steel, and so forth.

REPORT ON SUBMARINE BATTERIES (S. DOC. NO. 651).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 16, 1916, a copy of the

statement of the Secretary of the Navy made before the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, December 11, 1916, which includes the reports on submarine batteries in 1916 and the report on the explosion on submarine E-2, inclusive, which, on motion of Mr. BRANDEGEE, was, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 1814).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting lists of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business of the Department of the Interior and have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

John W. Hartnett, son and one of the heirs of William J. Hartnett, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 653);

Mary E. Lovell, widow of Bezaleel W. Lovell, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 654);

Margaret Ryan, widow of Patrick R. Ryan, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 655);

Mary L. Freeman, widow of Robert L. Freeman, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 656); and

Celestia A. Wolfe, widow of John S. Wolfe, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 657);

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6864) providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1917, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 19300) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of the deferred installments due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes in Oklahoma, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

SENATOR FROM ARIZONA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of the governor of Arizona certifying to the election of HENRY F. ASHURST as a Senator, which will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The certificate is as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, HENRY F. ASHURST was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency, our governor, George W. P. Hunt, and our seal hereto affixed at Phoenix this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL.]

GEORGE W. P. HUNT,  
Governor of Arizona.

By the governor:

SIDNEY P. OSBORN,  
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM CALIFORNIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of HIRAM W. JOHNSON, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from that State, which will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1916, HIRAM W. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of California a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of California to be hereto affixed, at the State capitol in the city of Sacramento, this 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

HIRAM W. JOHNSON,  
Governor of the State of California.

FRANK C. JORDAN,  
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented the certificate of the governor of Michigan certifying to the election of CHARLES E. TOWNSEND as a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning March 4, 1917, which was ordered to be filed.

SENATOR FROM OHIO.

Mr. HARDING. I present the credentials of Hon. ATLEE POMERENE, duly elected as a Senator from the State of Ohio, which I ask to have read and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files, as follows:

In the name and by the authority of the State of Ohio.

To all who shall see these presents, greeting:

This is to certify that at a regular election held in the State of Ohio on the 7th day of November, A. D. 1916, ATLEE POMERENE was duly elected a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, Frank B. WILLIS, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbus, Ohio, this 23d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

FRANK B. WILLIS, Governor.

C. Q. HILDEBRANT,  
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM FLORIDA.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present the credentials of Hon. PARK TRAMMELL, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida a Senator from that State for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917, which I ask may be received and read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, PARK TRAMMELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Florida a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, Park Trammell, and our seal hereto affixed at Tallahassee this 26th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

PARK TRAMMELL, Governor.

H. CLAY CRAWFORD,  
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I take pleasure in presenting the certificate of election of Hon. PHILANDER C. KNOX, who has been chosen as my successor in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the certificate.

The certificate was read and ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

In the name and by authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, executive department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, PHILANDER C. KNOX was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed at the city of Harrisburg this 19th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916 and of the Commonwealth the one hundred and forty-first.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

MARTIN G. BRUMBAUGH, Governor.

CYRUS E. WOODS,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the flag of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bridgeville, Pa., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Uniontown, Pa., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Girdland and Bellefonte, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Local Union No. 2739, United Mine Workers of America, of Gipsy, and of Local Union No. 1031, United Mine Workers of America, of Robertsdale, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation into the high cost of living, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WORKS presented a petition of Local Grange No. 357, Patrons of Husbandry, of Greenfield, Cal., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the United States Arsenal, Benicia, Cal., praying for an increase in their salaries, and also for the adoption of a civil-service retirement system, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented memorials of the Wholesalers' Board of Trade and the Credit Men's Association, of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the proposed repeal of the national bankruptcy law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the congregation of the Swedish Salem Mission Church, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota Rural Carriers' Association, of Winona, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to allow equipment maintenance to rural carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Crookston, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restore to the Government certain coal and petroleum lands now held by private parties, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the placing of an embargo on food products, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Willow Valley Farmer Club, of Alvina, Minn., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Berkeley and Oakland, in the State of California, praying for the placing of an embargo on food products, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Fargo, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit discrimination in the enforcement of distant tariff rates, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the Springfield (Mass.) Union of the United Brewery Workmen, remonstrating against prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Provincetown, Wellesley, Winthrop, Shelburne Falls, Framingham, Holyoke, and South Hadley, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Typographical Union of Springfield; of the Electrotypers' Union of Springfield; of Indian Hill Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of West Newbury; and of Northampton Lodge, Loyal Order of Moose, of Northampton, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against any increase in postal rates on second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.



He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Mass., praying for an investigation of the so-called Garden City building movement at Lomax, Ill., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Local Branch No. 35, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, of New Haven, Conn., praying for an increase in the salaries of post-office clerks, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 126, International Union of United Brewery Workmen, of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against prohibition in the District of Columbia, and also against national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wallingford, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, West Roxbury, Newton, Cambridge, Watertown, Arlington, Brighton, and Waban, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the placing of an embargo on coal, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### COMMON-LAW PROCEDURE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4551) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate the pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 892) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7556) to grant to the Mahoning & Shenango Railway & Light Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, complete, maintain, and operate a combination dam and bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River near the borough of Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 7557) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7558) for the protection of migratory birds; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and Protection of Game.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7559) for the relief of Guy A. Richards, Jesse L. Robbins, Isaac M. Grimes, William L. Irvine, and David Cox; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 7560) to increase the limit of cost of the Bureau of Mines building in Pittsburgh, Pa., \$50,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 7561) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of United States prisons and for the imprisonment of United States prisoners, and for other purposes," to fix the terms of office of the superintendent of prisons, the wardens, and the deputy wardens, to provide for their appointment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 7562) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Laurinburg, in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 7563) authorizing the President of the United States to date the commissions of graduates of the United States Military Academy one year ahead of the date of their graduation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 7564) granting an increase of pension to Emily Robinson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 7565) to provide for the erection of a public building at Dayton, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 7566) granting an increase of pension to Grover Cleveland McMahon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 7567) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Hobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Emelia Branner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 7569) granting an increase of pension to William Abbott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 7570) granting a pension to John F. Crowley; A bill (S. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Jerome McWethy; and

A bill (S. 7572) granting a pension to John J. Callanan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 7573) for the relief of Albert H. Campbell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7574) granting an increase of pension to Emma J. Bratton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7575) granting a pension to Jesse McAllister (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7576) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cramer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7577) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Caton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7578) granting a pension to Mary Alcinda Wingert (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7579) granting a pension to Lucy A. Cole (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7580) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Elvina Kelly (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7582) granting an increase of pension to Peter L. Leusler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7584) granting a pension to Margaret M. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 7585) granting an increase of pension to George Whitcher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### FARM-LAND BANK AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to introduce a bill and want to say a word of explanation with relation to it. I wish to protest in the name of Colorado against the action of the Federal Farm Loan Board in leaving a stretch of territory extending 1,400 miles east and west without a farm-land bank being located therein. All the western banks have been located near the Missouri River within 250 to 400 miles of each other and on the Pacific coast, and there is a vast intermediate domain where no bank has been located. There are lands in my State that are more than 800 miles by the nearest line of travel from the farm-land bank established for that district.

I want to say on behalf of my State and the Rocky Mountain region that the State of Colorado has as many acres of irrigated land as has the entire country of Egypt, which supports a population of 9,000,000 people. We have problems there that can not as accurately be solved in the other portions of the United States. We have the semiarid problem that is entirely different from those of the Mississippi Valley.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we should have had a bank located somewhere in that part of the country, and that the Federal Farm Loan Board did not take into consideration the due interests of the great Rocky Mountain region in their finding as to where the banks should be located.

It is true that people used to think that Colorado was only a gold and silver State, but I want to say that we produce in agriculture four times as much in value as we do of gold and silver. This is a growing section, because every acre of land between the Rocky Mountains and the eastern border of our State, as well as of the large mesas and valleys of the mountain region, will be cultivated and will produce remunerative crops. It is this new growing section, where interest rates are high and money is essential to development, that a farm-land bank is most needed. In the older sections farms have already been improved and many farmers have money to lend.

I therefore ask leave to introduce the bill and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 7583) to amend the Federal farm-loan act by providing for the establishment of the thirteenth Federal farm-land bank district, to be composed of the States of Colorado,



Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico, and to establish a Federal land bank therein at Denver, Colo., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide capital for agricultural development; to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgage; to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans; to furnish a market for United States bonds; to create Government depositaries and financial agents for the United States; and for other purposes," approved July 17, 1916, be amended by adding at the end of the second paragraph of section 4 thereof the following:*

*"There is hereby established a Federal land-bank district, to be designated as district No. 13, to be composed of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico, and there shall be established by the Federal Farm Loan Board a Federal land bank for said district at Denver, Colo. The above-named States shall be withdrawn from the districts in which they have been included from and after the passage of this act."*

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment only to announce and emphasize my sympathy with the attitude of my colleague with regard to the subject of the bill which he has just introduced. The great Rocky Mountain region, as he has well said, is no longer, strictly speaking, the mineral section of the United States exclusively, by which I mean it is neither dependent upon nor is population attracted to it as formerly by its wonderful mineral resources. It is a great agricultural country, and is becoming more so with the passing of every year. With regard to the irrigated portions of the country it occupies a position peculiar to itself, and, as a consequence, it would seem to be only natural that such a situation should appeal very strongly to the selecting power in determining where its Federal farm-loan banks should be located. It is a remarkable fact, one for which I can assign no intelligent reason, that in the distribution of these banks this region seems to have been entirely ignored or forgotten.

What is more remarkable, the place selected for the Federal farm-loan bank in the district of which Colorado forms a part is geographically out of touch with the greater part of the district. It is not even upon a main line of east and west travel. The roads which traverse it do not, generally speaking, run north and south. They supply a section of the United States which forms another district, excepting, of course, the State of Oklahoma. In order to reach it from New Mexico and from Colorado it is necessary to make at least one change of cars, and because of its geographical situation its selection might as well, for all practical purposes, have not been made at all.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just one moment. If this bank had been located at Topeka, or, if you please, in Kansas City, Kans., it would have been easily accessible to the entire district and would have been much more favorable and much more convenient, therefore, to our people. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado if there is any farm-loan bank site or location agreed upon which is to be found in any of that arid region where irrigation projects are going on?

Mr. THOMAS. With the exception of Spokane, I know of none. But the Senator is more familiar with that region of the country than am I.

Mr. BORAH. I suppose it was for the reason that the farm-loan act would not perhaps be applicable to that region where irrigation projects are located because of the defect of titles as yet; that there would, therefore, be no opportunity for the farmers to avail themselves of it.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho will agree that a large proportion of the lands in the region of country which he and I in part represent are lands that are obtained from the Government of the United States and are cultivated as such, and that the title is or ought to be quite as good as other titles emanating from the United States to its citizens.

Mr. BORAH. But the farmers who most need the benefits of this act are those who are now acquiring titles; that is, those who are just acquiring their lands and their homes. As I understand, by reason of the fact that there is this lien of the Government upon all these lands, the act could not be made available.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, that, Mr. President, may result from the actual operation of the law, but I do not think so.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If my colleague will allow me, I desire to state to the Senator from Idaho that the amount of land under Federal reclamation projects is insignificant compared with the total number of acres that are being brought under reclamation by private enterprise. Consequently, as to all those lands which are being improved under private enterprise, there can be no question but that the act can apply.

I wish also to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I supposed the act was intended to aid and assist those who are trying to build up homes, who are pioneers, while, as a matter of fact, the people in the older settled communities do not need assistance so much as it is needed by those in the new communities.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in my judgment the defect of the law, if I may say so, is that it can not be made applicable to or does not reach those who are pioneers and who are building up their homes, and so forth, unless they have actually completed their title. There is a vast number of people in that region who need it most whom it does not reach at all, and, in my judgment, whom it can not reach. I hope I am in error, but I fear it will not reach those who have a lien on their lands for water rights. If so, it is a serious defect and ought to be remedied.

Mr. THOMAS. Just another word. If the States of Colorado and New Mexico were not in the arid region, if the district for which Wichita has been selected as the point for the Federal loan bank were a purely agricultural one, with lands and titles and climate similar to those in Kansas and Nebraska and Missouri and Iowa, I would still protest against the action of the board in selecting a place for the bank, which is designed to contribute to the well-being of the entire section of the country, where it is geographically inconvenient of access and not centrally and fairly located. That is the main point of my complaint.

As I said before, if the location, however insignificant it might be as a community, were upon the main lines of east and west travel, so that it were readily and easily accessible, so that it were convenient to the mutual demands of the entire district, while I should still feel that the city where I live has not been fairly treated in this matter, I would voice no complaint, but accept the result with the best possible grace. Of course I am aware that the action of the board is final, unless it can be induced to reverse itself, and that, however inconvenient or inappropriate the place which has been selected may be, it will be difficult, indeed, to change it, except in the manner which is proposed by the bill which my colleague has just introduced. As a matter of fairness, as a matter of justice, however, to the great arid region of the Rocky Mountain West, either one of these banks should be located in some central position there, or the measure which my colleague has introduced should be incorporated into the law.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. STONE. I submit an amendment authorizing the President to extend to the Governments of Central and South America an invitation to be represented by their ministers of finance and leading bankers, not exceeding three in number in each case, to attend the second session of the Pan American Financial Conference in the city of Washington at such date as shall be determined by the President, and so forth, which I intend to propose to the Diplomatic and Consular bill (H. R. 19300). I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed, and that the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which accompanies the amendment, be referred to the committee to be considered in connection with the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted an amendment providing that hereafter each of the district judges of the United States shall receive a salary of \$9,000 a year, to be paid in monthly installments, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 18542), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the deputy clerk of the police court, District of Columbia, from \$1,600 to \$1,800, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19119), which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment relative to the transfer of documents, maps, plats, or other papers belonging to the executive departments, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment proposing that the appropriation for surveys and resurveys of public land for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, as provided for in the sundry civil appropriation act of that year, be made immediately available for the services in the General Land Office of a sufficient number of competent surveyors, etc., intended to be proposed



by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 18542), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—RICHARD HUDSON.

On motion of Mr. SMOOT, it was

*Ordered*, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 84, Sixty-fourth Congress, granting an increase of pension to Richard Hudson, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ANNUAL COST OF FEDERAL PRISONS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk and desire to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 301) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate a statement of the annual cost of the office of superintendent of prisons, his assistants, prison examiners, and clerks, together with the annual cost of the position of pardon clerk and the force in his office; also all expenses incurred as an incident to holding meetings of the parole board; also names and pay of each person connected with the offices of superintendent of prisons and pardon clerk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Georgia kindly explain the object of the resolution and why it should be agreed to?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall be glad to do so. The American Prison Association has passed resolutions criticizing our prison-parole system and advising a different system. There are those who are studying the question, and in connection with their study they desire the present cost of the existing system. To obtain that information is the only object of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ELLA M. JONES.

Mr. KERN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 302), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Ella M. Jones, widow of Frank G. Jones, late a private of the police force of the Senate Office Building, a sum equal to one year's salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### EXECUTIVE-SESSION PROCEEDINGS (S. DOC. NO. 652).

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a notice of a motion which I shall make to-morrow, looking to a proposed amendment of the standing rules of the Senate relative to proceedings in the executive sessions of the Senate. Ordinarily I would ask that the notice be read, but it is somewhat lengthy, and I ask that it may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, and also be printed in the usual form so that Senators can familiarize themselves with it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The notice and proposed amendment of the rules are as follows:

Senate resolution 306.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 2, 1917.

To the Senate:

Notice is hereby given that on the next legislative day I will move to amend certain of the standing rules of the Senate. A copy of the motion is hereto attached and made a part hereof.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

I move to amend the standing rules of the Senate as follows, to wit:

Amend Rule XXXV so that it will read as follows:

"On a motion to close the doors of the Senate on the discussion on any legislative business, no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than five minutes and a two-thirds vote shall be required for its adoption."

Amend paragraph 2 of Rule XXXVI so that it will read as follows, to wit:

"Executive business, including nominations and treaties, shall be considered in open executive session: *Provided, however*, That after the Senate upon motion made and adopted passes into executive session it shall be in order to move that any particular item of such

business shall be considered and acted upon in secret, and upon the motion no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than five minutes. If the motion is adopted by a two-thirds vote, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the Principal Legislative Clerk, the Executive Clerk, the Minute and Journal Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Assistant Doorkeeper, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary, and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy: *Provided further*, That treaties and confidential communications laid before the Senate by the President shall not be made public until the Senate enters upon their consideration, and not then if it is ordered as hereinafter provided that they shall be considered and acted upon in secret, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings in secret session shall be kept secret until the Senate by resolution takes off the injunction of secrecy."

Strike out paragraph 3 of Rule XXXVI.

Change present paragraph 4, making it 3, and also amend it by striking out in the second line thereof the words "or confidential."

Strike out paragraph 5.

Amend Rule XXXVII as follows, to wit:

By striking from the fourth and fifth lines the words "to remove the injunction of secrecy, or to consider it in open executive session."

Also, by striking out the ninth line on page 34 and substituting therefor the words "If it has been or is being considered in secret session."

Insert after the word "indefinitely," in line 20, page 34, the words "and a motion to consider it in secret session."

Also, by striking out paragraph 3.

Amend Rule XXXVIII by striking out paragraph 2 thereof.

If these amendments are made, Rules XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII will read as follows, to wit:

"RULE XXXV.

"On a motion to close the doors of the Senate on the discussion of any legislative business, no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than five minutes, and a two-thirds vote shall be required for its adoption.

"RULE XXXVI.

"EXECUTIVE SESSIONS.

"1. When the President of the United States shall meet the Senate in the Senate Chamber for the consideration of executive business, he shall have a seat on the right of the Presiding Officer. When the Senate shall be convened by the President of the United States to any other place, the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Senators shall attend at the place appointed, with the necessary officers of the Senate.

"2. Executive business, including nominations and treaties, shall be considered in open executive session: *Provided, however*, That after the Senate upon motion made and adopted passes into executive session, it shall be in order to move that any particular item of such business shall be considered and acted upon in secret, and upon the motion no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than five minutes. If the motion is adopted by a two-thirds vote, the Senate Chamber shall be cleared of all persons except the Secretary, the Chief Clerk, the Minute and Journal Clerks, the Sergeant at Arms, the Assistant Doorkeeper, and such other officers as the Presiding Officer shall think necessary; and all such officers shall be sworn to secrecy. *Provided further*, That treaties and confidential communications laid before the Senate by the President shall not be made public until the Senate enters upon their consideration, and not then if it is ordered as hereinafter provided that they shall be considered and acted upon in secret, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings in secret session shall be kept secret until the Senate by resolution takes off the injunction of secrecy.

"3. Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate and to punishment for contempt.

"RULE XXXVII.

"EXECUTIVE SESSION—PROCEEDINGS ON TREATIES.

"1. When a treaty shall be laid before the Senate for ratification it shall be read a first time, and no motion in respect to it shall be in order, except to refer it to a committee, to print it in confidence for the use of the Senate.

"When a treaty is reported from a committee with or without amendment it shall, unless the Senate unanimously otherwise direct, lie one day for consideration, after which it may be read a second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole, when it shall be proceeded with by articles and the amendments reported by the committee shall be first acted upon, after which other amendments may be proposed; and when through with the proceedings had as in Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the Senate, when the question shall be, if the treaty be amended, 'Will the Senate concur in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole?' And the amendments may be taken separately or in gross, if no Senator shall object; after which new amendments may be proposed. At any stage of such proceedings the Senate may remove the injunction of secrecy from the treaty, if it has been or is being considered in secret session.

"The decisions thus made shall be reduced to the form of a resolution of ratification, with or without amendments, as the case may be, which shall be proposed on a subsequent day, unless by unanimous consent the Senate determine otherwise, at which stage no amendment shall be received unless by unanimous consent.

"On the final question to advise and consent to the ratification in the form agreed to, the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators shall be necessary to determine it in the affirmative; but all other motions and questions upon a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote, except a motion to postpone indefinitely and a motion to consider it in secret session, which shall be decided by a vote of two-thirds.

"2. Treaties transmitted by the President to the Senate for ratification shall be resumed on the second or any subsequent session of the same Congress at the stage in which they were left at the final adjournment of the session at which they were transmitted; but all proceedings on treaties shall terminate with the Congress, and they shall be resumed at the commencement of the next Congress as if no proceedings had previously been had thereon.

"RULE XXXVIII.

"EXECUTIVE SESSION—PROCEEDINGS ON NOMINATIONS.

"1. When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees; and the final question on every nomination shall be, 'Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?'



which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless by unanimous consent.

"2. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken or on either of the next two days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection of a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

"3. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending, unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

"4. When the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than 30 days, all motions to reconsider a vote upon a nomination which has been confirmed or rejected by the Senate which shall be pending at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall fall, and the Secretary shall return all such nominations to the President as confirmed or rejected by the Senate, as the case may be.

"5. Nominations neither confirmed nor rejected during the session at which they are made shall not be acted upon at any succeeding session without being again made to the Senate by the President; and if the Senate shall adjourn or take a recess for more than 30 days all nominations pending and not finally acted upon at the time of taking such adjournment or recess shall be returned by the Secretary to the President and shall not again be considered unless they shall again be made to the Senate by the President."

#### COMPULSORY-ARBITRATION LAW OF NORWAY (S. DOC. NO. 650).

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have here a translation of the compulsory-arbitration law of Norway, which was approved last June. I ask to have it printed as a Senate document. The cost will not exceed \$15.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ABSENTEE VOTING.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a paper prepared at my request by the legislative reference division of the Library of Congress on the matter of absentee voting—something that at the present time is interesting the people in more than one State where the legislatures are in session. I ask that the paper be referred to the Committee on Printing, and I will venture to suggest to the committee that I trust they will consider it at as early a day as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

#### REPUBLIC OF CUBA V. STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. OVERMAN. I submit a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration. I ask that the resolution may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 300) was read, as follows:

Whereas the Republic of Cuba moved in the Supreme Court of the United States to be permitted to institute an action of debt against the State of North Carolina upon certain bonds purporting to be issued by the said State of North Carolina in the years 1868 and 1869, which said bonds are particularly described in the declaration of the Republic of Cuba filed with its motion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States is directed to use his offices with the Republic of Cuba to ascertain when and under what circumstances the Republic of Cuba acquired these bonds, and from whom it acquired them, and for what purpose it holds them, and what price, if any, it paid for said bonds; and if the Republic of Cuba has moved to institute suit against the State of North Carolina in behalf of itself, or in behalf of others who may own said bonds; and to communicate said information to the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that is a somewhat remarkable resolution to be adopted by the Senate. Perhaps I did not catch the reading of it very clearly; but as I understand it the Republic of Cuba has filed an application in the Supreme Court of the United States to be permitted to bring an action against the State of North Carolina. Therefore a judicial question is presented to the Supreme Court. It seems to me rather a remarkable thing when an action of that sort has been instituted for the Senate or for any department of the Government to take steps to compel a party litigant to disclose his case to the Senate. I never have heard of such a thing being undertaken before.

Mr. OVERMAN. All the State of North Carolina wants is information. I want to say, Mr. President, that the holders of these bonds have attempted to donate them to many of the States. For example, the great State of New York, when they were tendered to it, turned the offer down with contempt. When they were tendered to the great State of Rhode Island they were accepted by reason of an act of the legislature. The legislature passed an act authorizing the governor to accept them and to bring suit, and after the governor had in-

quired into the matter he called an extra session of the legislature, and in one of the most patriotic messages I have ever read, showing him to be a wise and patriotic man, urged the legislature to repeal the law, which they did unanimously. The holders of the bonds attempted to donate them to the great State of Michigan and Michigan turned down the offer with contempt, because, as they said—and other great States, to wit, the great State of Missouri—these bondholders were trying to use a sister State in order to coerce the State of North Carolina to make good bonds that had been repudiated, issued during the reconstruction days. That has been done many times.

All the State wants to know is the bona fides of this transaction. I think it is due to Cuba herself that these facts should be brought to her knowledge. I am satisfied that Cuba would like to know what was the ultimate object of these bondholders in the donation of these bonds or whether or not it is a scheme of the bondholders to use a sister Republic to aid them. All we ask is information as to how they were acquired, and whether Cuba owns them. I do not know that Cuba owns them. Is there any objection to North Carolina having information as to whether Cuba owns these bonds and how she acquired them? If it turns out that they were not donated to Cuba, and Cuba was not the bona fide holder, the Supreme Court would not take jurisdiction of the matter.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. What obstacle, if any, is there to prevent the State of North Carolina in its official capacity from making this request of the Secretary of State? In other words, why is it essential that action of this kind be taken by the Senate?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know that the State of North Carolina would have a right to ask the Secretary of State for any information. The request would properly come from the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. My impression is, with all due deference to my friend the Senator from North Carolina, not only that the request of the State would receive due consideration, but that it has a perfect right to go to the Secretary of State for this identical information in view of the facts which are recited by the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is also an international question which might come in here, as the Senator will find out.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case I think this should be a matter for congressional action, if we are to take any action at all, rather than a mere resolution of the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, all we want is this information.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not opposing the Senator's resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand.

Mr. THOMAS. But it seems to me that it is an unnecessary thing for the Senate to do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, why should not the Secretary of State use his good offices with a sister Republic to get this information for a great State of this Union? The question is whether or not they can sue on these bonds. That question is pending in the Supreme Court now; but if we get information which satisfies Cuba that the object of these people is to establish certain bonds that the States have repudiated, I am satisfied that Cuba itself would withdraw this case. Here is a sister State, one of the great States of this Union asking simply for some information. That is all it is. I do not see why the Senator should object to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I am only interested in preserving the distinction which exists between the different departments of this Government. It seems to me that this is a matter with which the Senate of the United States has nothing to do; that it would be a mere intrusion on the part of the Senate to pass a resolution of this character.

The resolution recites that a proceeding has been brought in the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, either that proceeding is well founded or it is ill founded. If it is well founded, the Supreme Court of the United States will hold so. We have not anything to do with it. We can not interfere with it. It is a judicial question. If it is ill founded, then the Supreme Court will discover it, and the proceeding will be dismissed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, that is so, Mr. President.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the proceeding is brought by the Republic of Cuba, and evidently brought upon the theory that a cause of action exists; and I can not see upon what theory the



legislative department of the Government can interfere in the matter at all. In other words, it is not any of our business.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President, does the Senator say it is none of the business of the Senate to aid a great State in getting certain information—in aid of doing justice? Not only is North Carolina involved, but there may be 14 or 15 other States concerned in this very question. Let me read from the bill for just one second, and the Senator will see what I mean:

The authority of the attorney for the Republic of Cuba to bring this suit was conferred by a decree of the Government of that country, which is ready to be exhibited to the court if desired.

Now, there is something concealed. They do not furnish the court even with the decree. All we want is information. The Senator can see himself that they simply make that broad statement—"the decree will be shown if desired."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let the Senator go to the tribunal that has jurisdiction over the question and get that information.

Mr. OVERMAN. I could not go before the Supreme Court and ask the Supreme Court to inquire of the Government of Cuba for certain information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The State of North Carolina can.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I do not think so. I do not think the lawyers could ask the Supreme Court of the United States in their suit for certain information as to the bona fides of this gift. We know in this country—we must take notice of the fact—that in the case of South Dakota—

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. CLARK. Has the Senator considered any other means by which this information might be obtained?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know of any other means.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think that application to the State Department, without this resolution of the Senate, would bring the same information that this resolution would bring?

Mr. OVERMAN. I candidly say to the Senator that I believe if I were to write a letter to the Secretary of State asking him to furnish the information, the Secretary of State would do it; but I think it would come with more grace from the Senate to ask for this information, to show Cuba that not only one of the great States of this Union is interested in this matter, but it interests the whole country.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, if the Senator's purpose is to rebuke the friendly Republic of Cuba, that is correct; but if he wants the information, as he says, undoubtedly he can get it without taking this legislative action.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no rebuke in it or intended. All the resolution asks is that the Secretary of State shall use his good offices to get information. All we want is information.

Mr. CLARK. Then why not get it from the Secretary without this resolution?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he has any information as to whether the motion made in behalf of the Republic of Cuba for permission to file a suit itself discloses anything about the ownership of the bonds? Does it allege that Cuba owns the bonds?

Mr. OVERMAN. Why, Mr. President, it is so mixed up in doubt that I can not tell whether it does or not. It says:

The authority of the attorney for the Republic of Cuba to bring this suit was conferred by a decree of the Government of that country, which is ready to be exhibited to the court, if desired.

They do not exhibit the decree in their bill at all.

Mr. CLARK. That is just the authority to bring the suit.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I know very little about this matter, although I have heard incidentally that there was such a proceeding about to be instituted and that it did not clearly develop whether the bonds were owned by the Republic of Cuba or had been acquired by a subordinate department of the Republic, and whether they were actually owned by the department or whether simply an arrangement had been made with the attorney who represents the owner.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is just what I want to get at. This petition does not disclose that fact, and while I do not know about it personally, my information is that the Republic of Cuba really does not own them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The application is not printed, but the memorandum in support of the application for leave to institute suit begins as follows:

This is an application on behalf of the Republic of Cuba for leave to bring an action at law in this court against the State of North Carolina upon a number of bonds of that State, payable to bearer, and now the property of the Republic of Cuba.

This is simply the memorandum.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I assume, of course, that in any suit, if permission is granted, the Republic of Cuba, or whoever the plaintiff may be, will have to prove its interest and prove its bona fides. As I understand, these are old bonds that the State has never recognized, and several transactions have been had with bonds issued under similar circumstances. The bonds are frequently passed around from one hand to another and sold at very small prices.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will let me interrupt him there, I want to say that these bonds, some \$13,000,000 of them, were issued for the purpose of building railroads. There was not a cross-tie laid nor an iron laid, and the bonds were hawked around on the market at 5 cents on the dollar. The State never received any return from them. The bonds are fraudulent, and because they were issued by fraud the State repudiated them. I am not going into the merits of the case, but most of the States have turned down these bonds, as I say. I have heard just what the Senator says, that the Cuban Republic does not own these bonds; but they have used that country by some sort of legislation to get before this court. Now, unless Cuba owns them, of course the Supreme Court could not have jurisdiction; and if we knew that fact that would be the end of the case. I think Cuba itself, our sister Republic, would be very glad for us to take this action and let us get this information. It is simply information that we want. There is no reflection involved on anybody.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why can not the State of North Carolina, which is a party to this proceeding, apply in the Supreme Court itself for a bill of particulars? Is there any reason why it can not do that?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is a question about which the Senator knows better than I do. I do not know; I have never looked into that question; but this is such a simple way to deal with the matter that I can not see why the Senator should object to it. Why not let the Secretary confer—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator says he can not see why I should object. I object upon exactly the same theory that I should object if a resolution were presented by the Senator asking to have information obtained by the Secretary of the Interior in some action that had been brought in which public lands were involved. My objection is that it is not any of our business; that it is the business of the court where the action is pending. I will say further, if the Senator will permit me, that I know something about these bond transactions, and I sympathize with the Senator's point of view.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator does.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that the State of North Carolina ought not to be compelled to pay these bonds, if I understand the facts, but it is the business of the court where the action is pending to determine, and it is not our business to determine, the question. It is not our business to aid either of the litigants to develop its case.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not for the purpose of developing the case; it is where a great State, a part of this great Union, says, through its Senators, the State would like to have certain information, and the Senate should aid in getting the information. We would like to have the Secretary of State get the information for us. I do not know whether the court would do that, and the Senator does not know.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator another question: If this is a proper way to proceed—that is, to invoke the aid of the State Department—why does not the State of North Carolina ask the intervention of the State Department, or why does not the Senator himself ask it? Why is it necessary to make the Senate of the United States an errand boy between the State of North Carolina and the State Department?

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not an errand boy. I can do it, and I will do it if the Senate should turn me down. I would be glad to do it, and I believe the Secretary will comply with my request, but I want them to know that the Senate of the United States is behind the great State of North Carolina in asking Cuba to furnish information to a sister State. I



can not understand why the resolution should not be passed. I can ask for the information; I will ask for it, but I would rather have this great body stand behind the State Department and say we would be very glad if you would give us this information.

There is a great deal involved in this question, Mr. President. Suppose that this is carried to its ultimate limits, every State in the South would be involved, because hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars were issued during those carpetbag days, from which the States reaped no benefit. Then, if the bondholders could get a judgment against any of these 11 States by a scheme to use foreign countries for their nefarious purpose it would be finally taken to The Hague, and the question would have to be settled there, and international trouble would be the result. So, in the last analysis, there is an international question involved. If we can show that they are doing in Cuba what they have tried to do in a dozen or more of the great States of the Union, knowing the facts incidentally, they would spurn the attempt at coercion with contempt. So it does seem to me that the Senator should agree to let the resolution pass.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to make this suggestion to the Senator from North Carolina. I believe he is right in saying this is a matter for diplomacy, or at least concurrently with the court, but it seems to me that he does not put the resolution on the right ground. He asks our State Department to secure from the Republic of Cuba certain information. Why does he not ask our Secretary of State to take up with the Republic of Cuba an inquiry as to the propriety of a foreign country coming into the United States and seeking to sue one of the States? I do not know of any provision in the Constitution that gives a foreign country the right to sue a State in the Supreme Court of the United States or in any other tribunal. I think it would be distinctly an affront to our country to make any such proposition. Suppose Germany were now to come to the United States and ask for leave to sue a State or to sue the United States in the Supreme Court of the United States on account of our violation of the law of neutrality, it would be distinctly a matter for settlement between the State Department and the Empire of Germany. Just so here; unless one can point out some distinction for a suit instituted by a foreign country against a State in the Supreme Court of the United States, I think that the Senator from North Carolina ought to broaden his resolution and ask the State Department to take up with the Republic of Cuba the propriety of making any such application.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator states it much better than I could possibly state it. I think he is right, and I think the Senator's statement, patriotically and broadly made, would be covered in the resolution. In other words, the Secretary of State will consider all the questions suggested as well as get this information.

It is a great matter of international concern that is involved. The Constitution, in Article III, section 2, states that in certain matters foreign Governments can sue a State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I call the Senator's attention to the language of the Constitution? Article III, section 2, provides that—

The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizens of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States; and—

To this I call special attention—

And between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign States, citizens, or subjects.

Then, further along, the provision is:

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction.

So the Constitution recognizes that there may be a case where a foreign State may sue one of the States of the Union, of which case the Supreme Court of the United States has original jurisdiction.

All I am insisting upon is that here is a case which upon its face appears to be properly brought, and the Senator is invoking the aid of the legislative branch of the Government to find out what evidence one of the party litigants has against the other. I insist that the remedy which the State of North Carolina has in that respect is to go into the tribunal which has jurisdiction of the subject matter and there make applica-

tion for a bill of particulars if the petition which has been filed is not sufficient.

Mr. OVERMAN. Suppose it be true—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Just a moment further. I am not going to object to the consideration of the resolution. I think it has no place here. With all due respect to the Senator—I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me—

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is a ridiculous thing for the Senate of the United States to pass such a resolution, but that is all I desire to say about it. I reserve the right to vote against it, but I make no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. As far as the bill of particulars is concerned, in a bill of particulars we would not possibly get the information we desire because it is left to the parties to state the particulars. We want this great Government to use its good offices in getting the information which we would not get in a bill of particulars, to use its good offices as the Senator has stated in reference to this sister Republic, for which we have spent millions, made war for, and given the people their liberty.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina as to a question of fact. Are the securities which are the basis of this suit held ostensibly by the Government of Cuba or by citizens of Cuba?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is just what I want to find out. The Senator from Utah read from the Constitution. If the Republic owns them and they are the property of the Republic, the court might have jurisdiction, though I deny that the Supreme Court has jurisdiction, no matter what the facts are. I understand that is not the case; I do not know that it is; they say here they are owned by the Republic. That is just the information I want. If this Government could use its good offices with Cuba, it would ask, "Cuba, do you own these bonds? If so, let us know just how you own them and why this suit is brought on bonds which have been absolutely repudiated by the State itself to make good bonds which a great sovereign State has by constitutional amendment repudiated?"

I hope no one will object to the resolution. All we want is the information. I am glad the Senator from Iowa made the statement he did, because it will go to the Secretary of State and the State Department will use its good offices accordingly. That has broadened the resolution, after what the Senator from Iowa has said about the resolution, and this would give them the authority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am not going to object, but I want to enter my protest about making the Senate of the United States a party litigant in this proceeding, which, if properly brought and authority exists under the Constitution for bringing it, is cognizable by only one tribunal. The parties litigant are the State of North Carolina and the Republic of Cuba. The resolution simply makes the Senate of the United States one of the parties litigant. That is all it does. If the real information is all that is desired, as the Senator himself says, undoubtedly it could be obtained without objection.

Mr. OVERMAN. I say I think we could use our good offices to do it.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me, as indicated in the remarks of the Senator from Utah, that we are meddling with something in which we have no present affair. It is a case solely for the consideration of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has original jurisdiction in such matters. If it has original jurisdiction and originally takes jurisdiction of the case, it should be unhampered by any outside parties by interfering either with the procedure or the facts of the case. If it has jurisdiction, the case should be presented as all other cases should be presented, and its ultimate result will depend upon the evidence which either party will produce.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator does not see the point. It may have original jurisdiction under certain conditions. It has not under other conditions.

Mr. CLARK. I suppose the Supreme Court is able to determine whether it has jurisdiction or not, and no action by the Senate can take from or add to whatever jurisdiction the Supreme Court may have. The question of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is not a question for the Senate to determine.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK. It is a question for that tribunal itself to determine. Therefore inasmuch as the Republic of Cuba, believing evidently that it has the right to make this application to the Supreme Court, makes it, it does seem to me, as



the Senator from Utah says, that we are meddling with something we ought not to meddle with.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina knows how kindly disposed I am toward him and how loath I would be to interrupt anything that appeals to him as this matter evidently does, but I am going to venture to ask the Senator if he does not think in view of the differences of opinion on the part of eminent lawyers in this body the resolution might well go over one day for consideration?

Mr. OVERMAN. This matter is very important, and I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. GALLINGER. It will come up to-morrow automatically if it goes over one day. Does not the Senator think it might be well to take that course?

Mr. OVERMAN. I am willing to have it go over if the Senator desires.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the resolution go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the resolution will go over for a day.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on December 27, 1916, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 7095. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912; and

S. 6116. An act providing for the taxation of the lands of the Winnebago Indians and the Omaha Indians in the State of Nebraska.

#### PEACE OVERTURE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution be read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 298) submitted by Mr. HITCHCOCK December 22, 1916, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate approves and strongly indorses the action taken by the President in sending the diplomatic notes of December 18 to the nations now engaged in war suggesting and recommending that those nations state the terms upon which peace might be discussed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it has been my desire, and still is my desire, to have the resolution considered to-day and acted on by the Senate. I am, however, particularly anxious that when considered and acted on it may be a nonpartisan way and, if possible, by a unanimous Senate. It has been suggested to me by Senators on both sides of the Chamber that, in the interest of that result, it might be better by unanimous consent to have the resolution go over until to-morrow, still holding its privileged position. Personally I am willing to have that action taken if any Senator desires further time or if Senators desire an opportunity for consultation and further consideration; otherwise I should like to have the resolution considered to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when the resolution was presented a few days ago I asked that it might go over. I did not make that request in a spirit of hostility to the resolution, but for the purpose of examining it with some care. I find that on a previous occasion the Senator from Nebraska offered a somewhat similar resolution, which went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I will venture to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that it would be better, in my judgment, that this resolution should go to that committee and that the committee should take it up. The Senator is a member of the committee, and I have no doubt he would get speedy action. If it is desirable that the Senate shall commit itself on this very grave question, it will be largely guided by the judgment of that great committee; and I will ask the Senator if he does not think that that would be a better procedure?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, in answer to that question, I will state I had considered that course, but I prefer this method for two reasons: First, it is more expeditious, and, in the second place, the moral effect of this resolution will, in my opinion, be better if the Senate, now that it is before it, should act upon it. The Senate is a coordinate authority with the President on international matters, at least on many international matters; it is in fact the only legislative body in the world with functions and powers relating to international mat-

ters. The parliaments of the old countries and the legislative bodies of other nations practically, in so far as the great nations at least are concerned, have no such functions and powers; but the Senate possesses them, and it has a reputation, it has a standing in the world similar, if not equal, to that of the President.

Now, it seems to me that the Senate has a duty to perform independently of the President. The President has performed his duty. The world is confronted with the greatest disaster in its history. Men are being killed at the rate of 3,000 a day; the wealth of the world is being used up to the extent of \$105,000,000 a day; and millions of men are being crippled each year. In the face of this tremendous calamity, now that the President has taken a step with the object and purpose of showing that the United States as a great neutral desires that the belligerent nations state what the possible terms of peace might be, it seems to me that it is timely that the Senate should act, and act at once.

Mr. President, there is no complication involved in this issue. I have been careful in my resolution so to limit its import and language as not to involve the Senate in an indorsement of the President's foreign policy, not even to involve the Senate in an indorsement of the argumentative parts of the President's letter, but to confine the indorsement entirely to an approval of the President's act in asking the nations at war to state terms of peace. I can not think there is any doubt in the mind of the country or in the mind of Senators here, without regard to party, that it will be the first step toward the end of the war if terms of peace can be stated. The nations may be far apart; we suppose they are; but some day, at some time, they must state what the possible terms of peace may be, and the sooner that step is taken the better. The importance, to my mind, of having the Senate, as the coordinate authority with the President, go on record in expressing the American desire that the terms of peace be stated lies in the fact that in all these countries there is a growing sentiment in favor of action looking to peace. That sentiment will be given great impulse if the Senate can add its plea to the plea already made by the President, and the end of the war may be in sight.

To my mind, Mr. President, it is of such importance and the issue is so simple that it ought not to be necessary to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope that it may be considered in a nonpartisan way, and I know that there are men on the other side of the Chamber who long as much as I do, and as any Senator could, to have a stop put to this awful horror. I am not speaking of our material interests; they are great; but we, as a neutral, have a right to ask this thing, not only a right given us by international law but specifically given to us in the terms of The Hague Convention.

So it seemed to me that the Senate ought to act on the resolution. I had not expected to say much on the subject, but I have felt that, if the question once arose here in the Senate, it probably could be settled in a nonpartisan way, and possibly even by a unanimous Senate. I know that the Senator from New Hampshire sympathizes with the general object in view, and I only suggested, if it were so desired, that this matter go over until to-morrow in the interest of greater harmony. If there is anything in the language of the resolution that should be amended, I should be glad to consider any such change.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to no man either in public or in private life in my desire to have the horrible condition in Europe terminated. I certainly would not under any circumstances, by voice or by vote, halt any movement that I believed would accomplish, or tend to accomplish, that result; but in reference to this resolution, Mr. President, I have received a large number of letters from men, whose judgment I deeply appreciate and whose wisdom I highly respect, saying that this resolution is not in good form, and that it will not tend to accomplish what the Senator from Nebraska has in view.

I have also read in influential journals, Mr. President, the very grave suggestion as to what our action may result in if we forget Washington's advice and enter into entangling alliances with foreign policies and foreign nations. I am not sufficiently well versed in constitutional law to know whether the objections which have been made are well grounded; but from one very influential source we are warned that we may endanger the supremacy of the Monroe doctrine if we interfere in these quarrels in any way with the nations of Europe. I do not know how that may be, but I should like a little time to look into it.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska does not feel like having the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations—and I shall not make a motion looking to that end—I



hope it will go over until to-morrow, and I trust that we may have time to calmly and dispassionately debate this question. So far as I am concerned, I shall take very few minutes in what I may have to say, and perhaps may not take any time at all; but there are great lawyers here on both sides of the Chamber who have looked into these matters of international concern very deeply, and whose opinions, if they care to express them, I would very much desire to avail myself of and to have the benefit of the conclusions that they may reach. So I say, Mr. President, if the Senator feels that the resolution ought not to go to the committee—though I think that would be the wise action to take—I trust it will go over without objection, and in due form come up to-morrow for consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think this resolution ought to go to the Foreign Relations Committee, where similar resolutions have already been sent. I think it ought to have the consideration of the committee.

This seems to me a very grave, a very large, and a very important subject. It is not one that can be whipped through in the morning hour as if it were an agreement to adjourn the Houses. It is of a most serious character. It deserves the examination of the Foreign Relations Committee and their advice to the Senate. There will be ample discussion of it, I am sure. I do not mean to say that there is the slightest desire to delay action upon it. The subject is altogether too important, in the opinion of some of us; certainly, to allow it to pass without discussion. I should like to say something in regard to it myself, and there are others who feel the same way. It will have to meet with thorough discussion before it leaves the Senate; also, there will have to be opportunity possibly to amend it if it is to pass.

I think, moreover, that we ought to have the necessary official papers before us. We have nothing now except the President's note that has come to us in an official form. I know that the fashion has been adopted lately of communicating with the Senate through the newspapers; but it seems to me that in this case there are a number of very important statements and notes that we ought to have in official form. It is not just to the Senate, it is not just to the department or to the administration, not to have them in proper form.

We have, as I have said, the President's note. There was a very important statement made by the Secretary of State after that note of the President had been published, in which he said that one reason for the note being sent was that we were on the verge of war. In the afternoon of the same day there was published another statement by the Secretary of State modifying the first statement; and on Sunday, the 24th of December, there was a third statement from the State Department in regard to the note. These were all official. We ought to have them in proper form. It is not just to the Secretary of State to discuss here what appeared in the newspapers. It may be accurate; it may not be.

We ought to have the German note of reply in full and in official form. The substance of it, it is stated in the newspapers, has been printed there. We ought to have the whole note before us. We ought to have the note of the entente allies, as they are called, in reply to the German note. We ought to have the Swiss note. We ought to have the Spanish note. We ought to have all these important State documents in official form. It is only just to us, just to the country, and just to the executive department, that before we discuss these questions we should have these papers before us in such a form that we know that they are accurate and official. We have none of them now, except the President's note.

I think to carry on this discussion on the basis of newspaper reports is not the way in which so serious a subject should be approached. I had hoped that sufficient time would be allowed to enable us to get those documents and those papers from the State Department, so that we might know before we acted. Also, I think the terms of the resolution require amendment; but that is a question of detail.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska, that I hope he will allow the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider this question. I trust, also, he will realize that this thing can not be hurried through. We must have an opportunity to discuss a matter so grave as this, which involves our relations with all the nations of the world. It ought not to be, and it can not be, hurried through as if it were some general matter of no special importance.

Of course, if the Senator prefers to let the resolution remain on the table, to come up to-morrow, I am not going to make any objection or make a motion to send it to the Foreign Relations Committee; but I am sure that there will be time for us to give it the discussion which it certainly deserves.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think it is unnecessary to send this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The resolution is simple in its terms, stating only a single proposition. What is that proposition? The President sent an identical note to the various belligerent powers of Europe, which note has been laid before the Senate officially. We have that; we know what that is. The resolution of the Senator from Nebraska is that the Senate approve this action of the President in sending to these belligerent nations the communication referred to. That is the whole of the resolution.

This note called upon the nations engaged in war for a statement as to the exact issues involved between them; in other words, to let the world know just what are the real, essential issues at stake in this bloody contest, and asking for such suggestions as might be made by them to us, a friendly power, as to the terms upon which peace might be discussed between them. That is a simple, plain forward proposition, quite easily understood. There is nothing in the note of the President to the powers that can not be easily understood. He sent this note of inquiry, asking questions of vital and world-wide moment. The act of the Chief Executive was manifestly taken with the hope of opening the door to negotiations which might lead to peace, which might lead to a cessation of these frightful hostilities which appall the world. Now, the question before the Senate to-day is whether the President acted rightly and whether we approve what he did. Why not take the judgment of the Senate on that? What is the need of sending that question to a committee, to have a committee debate it, and bring forth to you a report of their opinion?

The only possible good affirmative effect of any action whatsoever taken by the Senate must be the good effect of having the Senate approve the act of the President. If it is to amount to anything, the Senate must express itself as being in sympathy with the movement projected by the President to bring about world peace and normal world conditions. That is a question which necessarily addresses itself to every Senator here on the floor of the Senate, as well as it would to Senators in a committee room. If this resolution is to be referred to a committee, if a committee is to take it up and debate it for I know not how long, if it is to be made the subject of delay, if the Senate hesitates to approve the President's act, then the moral effect of even an approving Senate expression will be diminished.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has suggested that the resolution should be discussed in a committee, and that we should wait to have all the papers that are to come from the different belligerent powers in reply not only to the German note transmitted through our Government, but also the replies to the President's note. We would no doubt through these papers get the point of view of the belligerent nations when these papers come; but at this moment it seems to me we are up to this question: Whether the Senate, without waiting for foreign advices, shall express its own point of view on the President's note. Did the President do right in asking that the warring powers should state concisely and definitely the questions at issue and the terms upon which they would consider peace proposals? Shall we wait to hear from the capitals of Europe before we say whether we approve or disapprove what the President did?

Mr. President, I see no need of referring this resolution to a committee. I accord with the view of the Senator from Nebraska, since it is his request, that the resolution go over until to-morrow. I have no wish to foreclose any expression from any Senator with respect to this matter. Let every Senator say what he thinks; but I think, inasmuch as this matter is here in the form in which it appears before us, that the Senate should speak its opinion right out without any kind of evasion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I favor the adoption of a resolution such as has been suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. On the 20th day of April, 1916, I introduced in the Senate a resolution calling upon the warring powers for a calm consideration of the views that impelled the restoration of peace; and later on, on the 3d day of May, I offered a substitute for that resolution, which was then pending in the Foreign Relations Committee. I think it might be well, in addition to the approval of the President's note, for the Senate itself to make some expression upon this subject; and I shall therefore call attention to this substitute resolution for the one originally introduced by me, in the hope that it may furnish some suggestions upon this matter. I ask the Secretary to read the resolution.

#### VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.



The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon, with retired pay, certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives for reference.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 19300. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### OSAGE INDIAN SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6864) providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1917, which were: On page 1, lines 7 and 8, to strike out "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior"; on page 1, line 10, to strike out "not exceeding 10 years" and insert: "1 year"; on page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "on the condition of establishing vocational instruction in such schools," and to amend the title so as to read: "An act providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of one year from January 1, 1917."

Mr. OWEN. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator state what are the amendments of the House?

Mr. OWEN. The House limited the extension of the fund for the maintenance of the Osage school to 1 year instead of 10.

Mr. SMOOT. Is that the only amendment?

Mr. OWEN. That is the only amendment.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask if the Indians themselves object to continuing the school?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I shall have to insist on the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair under the rule laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill and a motion was made to concur in the amendments.

Mr. LODGE. At that point the privilege expired.

Mr. OWEN. I think it will take no time at all.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection at all.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no objection if it does not displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would rule that it did not displace the unfinished business. The Senator from Oklahoma moves that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. LANE. I ask the Senator if he will not allow the bill to go over. I received a communication this morning protesting against this identical measure, I think.

Mr. OWEN. I will say to the Senator that the half-breed element oppose it and the full bloods are in favor of it, and that is where the matter stands.

Mr. LANE. I do not know; but there was a claim made by a man representing himself to be an Osage Indian that these Indians maintain their own schools; that they have paid their taxes for public schools; and if this is the measure, although I may be mistaken, that there was no necessity for a further continuance of this institution at their expense. I should like to have time to look at it and check up against it. I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for, which is the unfinished business.

#### PEACE OVERTURE.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will yield for a moment, but I should like to have the resolution read which I sent to the desk.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I desire to ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] if he will consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business until we can decide whether my resolution shall go over until to-morrow by unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution has gone to the calendar under the rule. It is disposed of now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think we have had unanimous consent on other occasions under such circumstances.

Mr. LODGE. We had no unanimous consent; it never was granted. The resolution, under the rule, has gone to the calendar. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. GALLINGER. That is debatable.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not insist upon the motion at this time. It will simply delay matters and the resolution will not be disposed of.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am certainly in sympathy with the bill represented by the Senator from Michigan, but I feel that I have not been properly treated with this resolution. The resolution came before the Senate as a privileged matter, and I then, in order to concede to views on the other side, asked that unanimous consent be granted that it go over until to-morrow. Now the Senator from Massachusetts desires to take advantage of a technicality to deprive me and my resolution of what was about to be granted by unanimous consent and what he himself had consented to. I have no other recourse except to make the motion, unless by unanimous consent my resolution may go over until to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I made no objection to the unanimous consent. The Senator failed to get unanimous consent and now the resolution has gone to the calendar under the rule. I do not see why the Senator should try to put the resolution forward and crowd everything else out of the way. All I ask is a fair discussion, and I can assure the Senator that he will not advance his resolution by adopting these high-handed methods.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not adopting such methods. I have endeavored to do everything by unanimous consent, Mr. President; the Senator from Massachusetts himself consented to it; and by unanimous consent now this can be done.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Could we by unanimous consent now permit the resolution to go over to occupy the same position that it had before 2 o'clock?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so. It has been done on other occasions.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolution is on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The status of the resolution now is fixed, under a ruling of Vice President Sherman, as being on the calendar. That is the status of it, which would have to be changed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I have no recourse except to make this motion, and I make it only for the purpose of bringing the resolution before the Senate long enough to get unanimous consent for its consideration to-morrow. That is my only purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will have the same right to-morrow morning at the close of the morning business.

Mr. STONE. He has the same right now. Why not do it now?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator, of course, can do it now, if he wants to.

Mr. STONE. He has made the motion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Can we not by unanimous consent take the resolution off the calendar and give it the status which it occupied before 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that that can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I make the request.

Mr. BORAH. I think we ought to do so for the reason that the Senator from Nebraska understood, and all understood, that it was to go over until to-morrow, but by reason of the fact that a Senator was occupying the floor it went to the calendar. As to the resolution in its present form, I am not speaking for the resolution when I make this suggestion, but I think if unanimous consent can be had under the rule it ought to be given.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is evident, Mr. President, that that can be granted. I hope the Senator will ask for it, and I hope it will be granted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall have no objection to the resolution going over until to-morrow if it is to be considered during the morning hour, but the Senator from Nebraska has asked for its status to be fixed for determination to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not asking for that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If unanimous consent is granted so that the Senator's resolution shall take its place on the calendar for consideration to-morrow the same as though it had not gone to the calendar to-day, I have no objection to it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, Mr. President, I make the request that the resolution be taken from the calendar for consideration to-day, and that it go over under its privileged character for consideration to-morrow.

Mr. GALLINGER. In the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES. Would this displace the unfinished business?

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has stated that it would not.

Mr. LODGE. It comes up only as a resolution to-morrow at the close of the morning business, occupying then the same position it occupied this morning.

Mr. JONES. The Senator's request was that it be taken up for consideration to-day.

Mr. LODGE. No; from the calendar.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That it be taken from the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. Taken from the calendar and placed where it was before with the privilege it then had. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I now ask that the resolution which I sent to the desk may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 303), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the people of the United States of America, consisting for the most part of the children by birth or descent of the warring nations in Europe, view with profound distress the continuance of a war, calamitous to all and beneficial to none.

From the small beginning of a movement made by a Teutonic State to punish a Slav State for an alleged conspiracy against its national life, resulting in the assassination of its Crown Prince, the most destructive and frightful war in history has resulted.

The distinguishing characteristics of this war include on the part of each participant the disclaimer of responsibility for its commencement or continuance, the assurance that it is not animated by a desire for conquest, the declaration that it is fighting for its national life, and mutual protests against dominant individual militarism either on land or sea.

The frightfulness of the past two years has surpassed the predictions of the most sinister imagination. The warring nations are dimly conscious of the terrors of the future, through the experiences of the past, but interlocked in the deadly but indeterminate struggle of the trenches, can not stop to deliberate. The continuance of the war means loss to all and gain to none. The only hope of peace lies apparently in the exhaustion of all, accompanied perhaps by a barren victory for the power whose exhaustion is least complete. Victory so attained will be at a stupendous cost, far exceeding its value, and thus the only result of continued warfare will be the common deterioration of race and impoverishment of condition.

The Senate of the United States, conscious that this Government owes a duty to posterity in the maintenance of the long-established principles of civilized warfare as applied to neutral rights, and fearful lest it be drawn into the vortex, seizes this opportunity when its relations with one of the warring powers are in the balance to urge the combatants who are now conducting the world's tragedy to express in some concrete form, without acrimony, taunts, or threats, what proposals can be made the basis of a desired peace, and to suggest to the Teutonic powers that having accomplished the declared purpose of the war, the punishment of Serbia, they may, without imputation of weakness, make such reasonable proposals regarding the restoration of the status quo, the gradual reduction of military burdens, and the substitution of reason for force in the adjustment of international disputes as to command the favor and impress the judgment of the people of the neutral and warring nations.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, when this matter comes up for discussion I shall ask for the consideration of the resolution offered by me in May last regarding the restoration of peace in Europe in connection with the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I have no fixed views now as to whether it is wise to add anything to the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska, but it may well be a subject of serious consideration as to whether an independent statement made by the Senate of the United States expressing its views regarding this calamitous condition will not be of great influence in bringing about a restoration of peace. I invite particular attention to the suggestion in the resolution that whatever proposals are made should be made without acrimony, taunts, or threats.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very important and illuminating editorial from the New York Sun in reference to the matter that has been under discussion. I ask unanimous consent, and I do it at the request of several Senators, that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

PRESIDENT WILSON ATTEMPTS TO PLEDGE UNITED STATES TO REVERSAL OF TRADITIONAL FOREIGN POLICY.

NEW YORK, December 26.

The New York Sun, in a strong editorial, points out some of the serious implications of the recent "peace note" of President Wilson. The Sun says:

"Mr. Wilson may not be proposing peace; he may not be proposing mediation; he may not be interposing his hand or his head between the belligerents who are fighting this European war; he may not be sulking his acts to Germany's present desires—but the fact remains that he is not only proposing something which no President of the United States ever before proposed, but also pledging this Nation to something which no President of the United States has the right or the power to pledge. That something is the annihilation of the Monroe doctrine, which has governed the policy of the Republic for almost one century of the Republic's existence.

"Mr. Wilson speaks with feeling of the interests of the United States as a neutral power in relation to the war waged for European politics.

"There is no other interest of the United States of such transcendent importance as that which lies behind the traditional refusal of our Government to mix in the political affairs of the European nations and its traditional determination, so often and in so many forms declared, to permit no European interference with the destinies of the Republics of North, Central, and South America, no extension of European political influence in the Western Hemisphere.

"We are not discussing the merits of the Monroe doctrine or now examining its health to see if it is senile, moribund, fit for no further progress except a journey to the last resting place of obsolete and superseded national policies. We merely call attention to the outstanding fact that the proposal and pledge which occur in the course of President Wilson's eloquent expression of the natural hope of American civilization and humanity to see peace restored on a lasting basis would incidentally send the Monroe doctrine straight to the tomb. This is not to be dismissed as a matter of academic interest; its bearings on our international relations are those of a revolutionary change with practical consequences immeasurable. It means not only the utter abandonment of our attitude of aloofness from the complications of European politics, but also the absolute surrender of the position which we have maintained against all comers with regard to the American Republics south of our border. The participation of the United States in European guaranties inevitably means the entering of the European powers into the affairs of the Western Hemisphere wherein we have assumed and exercised an exclusive function. Specifically, it means European cooperation and tutelage in the affairs of Mexico, of Guatemala, of Honduras, of Nicaragua, of San Domingo, of Costa Rica, of Panama, of Colombia, of Venezuela, and so on, down to the jumping-off place of Pan American policy at Cape Horn. There is no avoiding the fact that the United States can not abolish one-half of the Monroe doctrine and preserve intact the other half.

Here is President Wilson's proposal and his pledge:

"In the measures to be taken to secure the future peace of the world the people and Government of the United States are as vitally and as directly interested as the Governments now at war. Their interests, moreover, in the means to be adopted to relieve the smaller and weaker peoples of the world of the peril of wrong and violence is as quick and ardent as that of any other people or Government. They stand ready, and even eager, to cooperate in the accomplishment of these ends, when the war is over, with every influence and resource at their command."

In this passage as the World justly remarks, 'the President pledges the cooperation of the United States in the enforcement of future guaranties of the peace of the world and the integrity of the small and weak nations of Europe. It can not be made too clear that whether this is or is not a desirable departure from past policy, it is a departure involving not only our participation in the control of the destinies of Belgium and Serbia and Roumania, but also participation of Great Britain and Germany and Russia and France and Italy in the control of the destinies of Mexico, of the Central American States, of Venezuela; why not even of Cuba?

"For—the Monroe doctrine thus blithely swept away in the exuberance of emotional rhetoric is beyond the power of President Wilson to annul. The Government of the United States, by the joint action of Executive and legislature, has officially declared the Monroe doctrine to be its policy. Our participation in the peace conferences at The Hague, and our assent to the conventions there framed, were distinctly qualified and limited by this declaration:

"Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not entering upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or internal administration of any foreign State, nor shall anything contained in the said convention be so construed as to require the relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions."

"As the American historian of the first peace conference at The Hague, himself one of the American delegates, well said: 'Not even in the supposed interest of universal peace would the American people have sanctioned for one moment an abandonment or the slightest infraction of a policy which appeals to them as being founded, not only upon legitimate national desires and requirements, but upon the highest interests of peace and progress throughout the world.' And the general conventions both of the first conference at The Hague in 1900 and of the second in 1907 were ratified by the Senate of the United States with this broad and significant reservation specifically recorded as part of the contract.

"President Wilson can, if he sees fit, propose the relinquishment of the Monroe doctrine as the traditional policy of the United States by negotiating with European countries new treaties affecting the entry of this Government into political entanglements of European concern and conversely admitting European powers into political engagements of purely American concern. The Senate of the United States can, if it



chooses, validate such proposed treaties by the constitutional process of ratification.

"But until that has been done the Monroe doctrine stands as our declared policy in international relations, and there is no more power in the White House to extinguish it, or to pledge the people and the Government of the United States to the guarantee of European boundaries, than there is in this newspaper or in the executive offices of the Pennsylvania Railroad."

#### VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 392) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as the "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, in the interest of expedition, I had thought to consume no time of the Senate in discussing this bill. It has been before the Senate and on its calendar for several years and is, I believe, well understood by most, if not by all, Senators, but inasmuch as so much prejudice has been displayed and so much misinformation has been submitted it seems best that I should state briefly its provisions and objects.

The bill proposes to establish a retirement roll for the benefit of honorably discharged volunteer officers of the Civil War. It is offered in compliance with precedent established by Congress in 1828 and 1832 when the surviving officers of the Revolutionary War were placed upon a similar roll with full pay of the highest rank held by them in that war, not exceeding, however, in any case the full pay of a captain.

The officers and men of the Revolutionary War were inadequately paid, but at the close of that war Congress gave the officers full pay for five years thereafter. It also gave to officers and privates large grants of land. Each enlisted man received 100 acres and to officers, according to their rank, larger grants were made. To a captain 300 acres were given, as I recall it now, 500 acres to a colonel, and so forth. Many of the States also gave lands in even larger amounts to their Revolutionary soldiers. In some States, North Carolina, for instance, 25,000 acres were granted to a major general.

Furthermore, it is approximately, but all too tardily, carrying out what was supposed to have been a sacred promise made to these men by their Government through its Congress and President in 1861. That promise was that the officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates organized under the acts calling and providing for volunteers should in all respects be placed on the same footing as to pay and allowances of similar corps of the Regular Army; that every volunteer received into the service who should be wounded or disabled in such service should be entitled to the benefits which had been or might thereafter be conferred upon members of the Regular Army.

There has been some question exactly as to what those acts of Congress were, and I will insert in full the acts of July 22 and July 25, 1861. Those enactments must be construed as one act, the second having been passed but three days after the first, and evidently to make a correction in the first. The act of July 22, 1861, section 5, provided:

*And be it further enacted*, That the officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates, organized as above set forth shall, in all respects, be placed on the same footing, as to pay and allowances, of similar corps of the Regular Army.

Opponents of the bill say that was intended to apply simply to the pay of the volunteer officers and men during their service in the Civil War, but three days thereafter the same Congress passed this act, as if to correct an omission which had been made in the first law:

*Sec. 2. And be it further enacted*, That the Volunteers authorized by this act shall be armed as the President may direct; they shall be subject to the rules and articles of war, and shall be upon the footing, in all respects, with similar corps of the United States Army, and shall be mustered into the service for "during the war."

Afterwards, in August, The Adjutant General of the United States promulgated this order to the Army, quoting the two statutes, the one of July 22 and the other of July 25, thereby stating to the soldiers who enlisted that they should be treated not only for the present but for all time the same as were the officers of the Regular Army, and if any benefit should accrue to an officer or private in the Regular Army because of his service in the Civil War, that benefit should also accrue to the volunteer.

It seems to me there can be no possible question as to that proceeding. This promise meant, if it meant anything—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Have any copies of those acts been printed, specially for this discussion, where we could lay our hands on them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have just read the sections, but I will include the whole acts of July 22 and July 25 in my remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was under the impression the Senator had them put in the Record before and that we then could get a copy of the Record containing them.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The act of July 22 is in the House hearings. The act of July 25 is not in the House hearings. For some reason or other that has been omitted, but I will put both acts in the Record in connection with my remarks. They appear in General Orders, No. 49, issued by Adj. Gen. Thomas on August 3, 1861.

The acts referred to are as follows:

[General orders, No. 49.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Washington, August 3, 1861.

1. The following acts of Congress are published for the information of the Army:

"An act to authorize the employment of Volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property.

"Whereas certain of the forts, arsenals, customhouses, navy yards, and other property of the United States have been seized, and other violations of law have been committed and are threatened by organized bodies of men in several of the States, and a conspiracy has been entered into to overthrow the Government of the United States: Therefore

*"Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept the services of Volunteers, either as Cavalry, Infantry, or Artillery, in such numbers, not exceeding 500,000, as he may deem necessary, for the purpose of repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, enforcing the laws, and preserving and protecting the public property:

*Sec. 2. And be it further enacted*, That the said Volunteers shall be subject to the rules and regulations governing the Army of the United States.

*Sec. 5. And be it further enacted*, That the officers, noncommissioned officers, and privates organized as above set forth shall in all respects be placed on the same footing as to pay and allowances of similar corps of the Regular Army.

*Sec. 6. And be it further enacted*, That any Volunteer who may be received into the service of the United States under this act, and who may be wounded or otherwise disabled in the service, shall be entitled to the benefits which have or may be conferred on persons disabled in the Regular Service; and the widow, if there be one, and if not, the legal heirs, of such as die or may be killed in service, in addition to all arrears of pay and allowances, shall receive the sum of \$100.

"Approved, July 22, 1861."

"An act in addition to the 'Act to authorize the employment of Volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property,' approved July 22, 1861.

*"Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept the services of Volunteers, either as Cavalry, Infantry, or Artillery, in such numbers as the exigencies of the public service may in his opinion demand, to be organized as authorized by the act of the 22d of July, 1861: *Provided*, That the number of troops hereby authorized shall not exceed 500,000.

*Sec. 2. And be it further enacted*, That the Volunteers authorized by this act shall be armed as the President may direct; they shall be subject to the Rules and Articles of War, and shall be upon the footing in all respects with similar corps of the United States Army, and shall be mustered into the service for "during the war."

*Sec. 3. And be it further enacted*, That the President shall be authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for the command of the Volunteer forces, such number of major generals and of brigadier generals as may in his judgment be required for their organization.

"Approved, July 25, 1861."

By order.

L. THOMAS, Adjutant General.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the Senator passes from that point, may I ask him whether there is any change other than that to which he has called attention made by the second act?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No material change. The second act does not confine the words "in all respects" to "pay and allowance," but deliberately omits those words and puts the Volunteers on the same footing in all respects with soldiers of the Regular Army in the Civil War.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The only difference between the two acts, then, as I understand the Senator, is that in the second act they omitted those qualifying words.

Mr. TOWNSEND. As to this particular matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to the particular matter in the second act. In other words, they broaden the act.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They broaden the act so as to include Volunteers in all the privileges and benefits which could come to them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would seem to indicate very significantly that that was the particular thing they desired to accomplish. Let me ask the Senator, further, was there a report of the committee accompanying the second act?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; the second act was not reported by the House committee at all. It was not presented to the committee. The first one was, but the second was not. My attention was afterwards called to this subject by officers who were interested in the matter, and I investigated and found they were absolutely correct in their position.



Mr. SUTHERLAND. There was no discussion on the floor of the House in reference to it when originally presented.

Mr. TOWNSEND. When the law was passed? I have not investigated to see.

This promise meant, if it meant anything, that volunteer officers and privates should receive not only the same pay and emoluments as were received by officers and privates of the Regular Army for service in the Civil War, but it meant that any emolument or benefit which, as a result of service in the war, carry to the Regular Army officer should be shared by the volunteer officer for an identical service. The private volunteer was by the act of 1912 rewarded for his service, and to-day he is receiving from 75 to 100 per cent more than he received in the war. But the volunteer officer not only does not receive what he received during the war—and of this he does not complain, for he has never asked for such pay—but by the act of 1890 his pride in and benefits of rank to which he was entitled having earned them through years of the greatest patriotic service ever rendered by men to their country, were taken from him. Prior to 1890 disabled officers were pensioned in accordance with their rank, but the act of that year demoted them to the ranks, although the rank of the Regular Army officer was retained for pensionable or retirement purposes.

By the acts of Congress officers of the Regular Army have been retired upon reaching the age of 64 years and at three-fourths pay of their highest rank. This fact, however, is justified by the opponents of the pending bill on the ground that the Regular officer has been a long time in the service and his retirement is in recognition of such service. Now, I must not be understood as condemning the retirement of Regular Army officers. I know that such action is in harmony with the dictates of notions for the public welfare and the needs of national defense. I am, however, constrained to meet the argument as presented against this bill, and if the comparison is invidious to the Regular Army officer it is not because I am antagonistic to him, but because the opponents of this measure have used him to belittle the service and sacrifice of those men who mustered, trained, and led more than 90 per cent of the men who fought the battles and preserved the Union in 1861 to 1865. More than 95 per cent of the officers of the Regular Army never engaged in a battle, thank God, never knew what actual war was. For years they have been secure in the knowledge that their financial and social career was established for life. Old age, penury, and want have no terrors for them.

This city is decorated with hundreds of old retired Army officers who never saw an armed enemy, who never heard a hostile gun. Hundreds of widows of officers with similar service are living here in greatest comfort, the recipients of their Government's bounty. Not only here are such as these found, but they are scattered all over the country. I am not complaining at this treatment by the Government. I would not take one dollar from these beneficiaries. But what has this Government done and what is it doing for the men, 95 per cent of whom by actual service on the field of battle won the rank which a grateful country then conferred upon them for organizing, training, and leading the forces which preserved the Union and maintained amidst the almost universal standards of monarchy the one great flag of democracy? It is true that most of these officers when the war was over and their country no longer needed their services retired modestly to their homes and helped to repair the waste of war. Some of them were successful in business. They were great men and capable of great things, but most of them had impoverished their strength, impaired their nervous and vital energy during long years of service in camp and march and battle. The opportunities which were theirs when they entered the war were either taken by the home guard or else these soldiers were physically incapable of taking advantage of them. The years rolled on and these men were crowned not with the honor and emoluments which every other great nation has conferred upon those who fought its battles, but with neglect and ignominy.

Time has bred forgetfulness, if not contempt, until, as I have said, the precious boon of merited rank has been taken from them, and when the few who remain, many living in soldiers' homes, others the objects of different forms of public charity, and still a few others in comfort, when these ask that their Government's promises be kept they are held up to scorn and ridicule.

I have stated that these volunteer officers feel that the Government's promise to them in 1861 has not been fulfilled, and I concur in their belief.

When the war closed not all the volunteer officers returned to their homes. Some of them enlisted in the Regular Army, and afterwards, when they reached the age of 64 years, they

were by acts of April 23, 1904, June 29, 1906, and March 2, 1907, retired, not at the rank held by them at the date of retirement, but exclusively because of their service as volunteers in the Civil War at a rank and pay one grade in advance of their highest rank in the service. In other words, a captain in the Regular Army 64 years old who had served one day or more as a volunteer in the Civil War is now retired with the rank and pay of a retired major and a colonel is retired as a brigadier general. Under these acts I am informed that about 1,000 officers of the Army and Navy are receiving increased pay solely for service in the Civil War. Can Congress say that the Volunteers have been treated the same as the Regular Army officers? Not only this, but on March 3, 1905, Congress placed upon the retired list of the Army Gens. Hawley and Osterhaus, with rank of brigadier generals. They were general officers of Volunteers in the Civil War and had never served a day in the Regular Army.

Shall Congress longer permit tactics of obstruction to prevent this act of justice to the remnant of its greatest benefactors?

But, sir, there are other than obligations based on contract which impel me to support this bill. Our Nation has embarked upon the policy of largely providing for its defense through the call for Volunteers. Already that system is said to be breaking down. At this moment the militia volunteers feel that they have been induced to enlist under false pretenses; that, indeed, the Republic is ungrateful and looks upon the militiaman as a man who owes a duty to his country not shared by others and that the sacrifice of home and opportunity will finally win for him the title of "old vet" or "old pensioner," and if he shall insist that he is not a pawn to be played for and by others and asks for a discharge he may be branded as coward or traitor. If we are to depend upon the volunteer in case of actual war, our Government must demonstrate that it is not ungrateful and that its word is good. It is already very late to do what ought to have been done a dozen years ago. The beneficiaries are now on an average about 80 years old. They are dying at the rate of about 15 per cent a year, and the death rate is rapidly increasing. Since I first introduced this bill in the Senate there have been six different chairmen of the officers' committee. Five of them have gone to their great reward. These were grand men who survived the carnage of war but sacrificed their lives in an effort to secure recognition of their brother officers at the hands of a Government which they, perhaps, more than any other influence helped to preserve.

A letter was placed in the RECORD some weeks since by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] from a private soldier of the Civil War protesting against the passage of this measure. Mr. President, that letter does not voice the sentiment of the survivors of the great Grand Army of the Republic. Its writer has not only misrepresented his comrades and slandered the volunteer officers of the Civil War, but evidently with malice aforethought he has falsified the facts.

I have stood sponsor for this bill in the House and in this Senate for eight years. It has been known to the Civil War veterans of the country that I was especially interested in the measure, and yet I do not recall having received during that period a communication of protest. I have, however, received memorials from many Grand Army posts expressing sympathy and support. I can conceive of no man more lacking in the spirit of gratitude and patriotism than the alleged private soldier who opposes the bill for the reasons given by the correspondent of the Senator from Georgia. Why, sir, this bill does not affect by the fraction of a mill the pension received by the privates. Note the difference between the spirit of this defamer and that demonstrated by the volunteer officers. Every general pension law written into our statutes has been urged upon Congress by committees composed of volunteer officers. When the act of 1912 was before Congress this committee of volunteer officers asked me to withhold pressure for this pending bill until the general law could be enacted, lest in some way the latter might be retarded. The officers, as in war so in matters of pension legislation, have led the forces to victory.

But the Senator's correspondent says that the services rendered and the responsibilities assumed by the officers were no greater than those by the private soldier. Mr. President, I will not make comparison between the patriotism of officers and men. He who places his all upon his country's altar has made the supreme sacrifice. Whether he leads or follows, whether it is his duty to command or obey, whether he plans the campaigns and directs the forces or blindly follows the orders of his commander, there is no one ranks him in patriotism. That there are, however, grades in service and responsibility is evident to everyone. Every nation has recognized this difference and every nation recognizes it to-day.



The officer as a rule is older and more experienced. As a rule he is selected to command because of his proven fitness. At the beginning of the Civil War he raised companies and regiments and drilled them for service. He was made responsible for the health and lives of the men. He was charged with thousands of dollars' worth of Government property. It was his business to know not only military tactics but to understand the campaign. He furnished his own equipment and paid for his own food. He was the head of his particular division of men, and the military and civil history of the world recognizes the head as of the greatest importance. If it is true that the volunteer officer is entitled to no greater or other recognition than the enlisted man, then our Army and Navy to-day is improperly organized as to pay and emoluments. The officers should receive no more than the privates, if such philosophy is to be applied.

But, Mr. President, the most voluble argument and the most unworthy one used against the bill is its cost. As for myself, sir, I would not be swerved from my advocacy of the measure if I knew it would cost double what I believe it will cost. With me it is a question of sacred obligation and duty and not one of dollars and cents. If it is true that these old patriotic heroes did more than any others to preserve our Union; if it is true that our Government in its time of threatened destruction made promises which have not been kept; if it is true that the greatest security which our Nation may know is keeping faith with the people from whom must come its future defenders; if it is true that a majority of the men who organized, trained, and led victorious armies of the United States from 1861 to 1865 are now either in want or the occupants of soldiers' homes, I hold it to be my patriotic duty to my country as well as to these old men, who at the end of 80 years are now standing in open graves waiting for the falling earth, but with ears strained to catch the word from Washington, which keeps the half-century-old promise to their hearts, I hold it to be my sacred duty to grant this belated recognition. Aye, I hold it to be my duty to vote whatever sum may be necessary to grant this relief.

Let us cut out a few unnecessary river and harbor improvements. Let us refuse to pass a political emergency public-buildings bill, but let us not longer delay even the partial satisfaction of an obligation as high as patriotism and as sacred as human sacrifice.

But, Mr. President, it is right and proper that Congress should know approximately at least the amount of money this bill, if enacted into law, will carry. Unfortunately an approximation of the cost is the best that is possible. Since 1890 there has been no separate lists kept of officers in the Pension Department. They are now rated the same as enlisted men.

Every possible means has been employed to determine the exact number except the unpracticable method of examining all of the more than 300,000 list of pensioners in the Pension Department. There are several ways for obtaining an approximation, and all have been used, and inasmuch as the results obtained separately by each is practically the same as the others, it is absolutely safe to conclude that such result is correct.

First, there are 21 commanderies of the Loyal Legion in the United States whose membership is composed entirely of officers who saw service in the Civil War. They have been especially interested in discovering all the volunteer officers who served in that war. They are peculiarly equipped to obtain information on this subject. They have aided the committee in every way possible.

On January 31, 1914, these commanderies had as members 3,310 volunteer officers. Their investigation induced them to believe that this number was two-fifths of all the surviving volunteer officers, and that there were therefore a total of 8,275 living on January 31, 1914.

On August 31, 1915, these commanderies had 2,960 volunteer officers as members, which was two-fifths of 7,220, the total living at that date. They determined at that time that the death rate was at least 45 deaths a month. It is larger now. From August 31, 1915, to December 31, 1916, is 16 months, and during that time the deaths would be approximately 22 times 45, or 990. Deducting 990 from 7,220, we would have living, under the Loyal Legion calculation, 6,230 volunteer officers.

Second, Henry W. Littlefield, of Germantown, Pa., president of the Pennsylvania Association of Union Volunteer Officers, made an independent investigation through the Grand Army posts, Loyal Legion commanderies, and the Pension Department and presented the results to the House Committee on Military Affairs. He worked out a table showing the number in each of the different ranks and their length of service. His table was inserted in the House hearings on a bill similar to the one pending here. His calculation was of December 31, 1915, and showed 7,200 survivors at that time. If we are to

deduct the deaths at 45 a month since December 31, 1915, his total of living on the 31st of December, 1916, would be 6,660.

Third, Col. C. R. E. Koch, chairman of the Volunteer Officers' legislative committee, last year went to the Commissioner of Pensions and asked that several thousand pension certificates be drawn promiscuously from the files and actual inspection be made with a view to determining what proportion of the pensioners were officers and what privates. This was done, and the result showed that out of every 55 pensioners 1 was an officer. In other words, the ratio of officers to privates was 1 to 54. On October 31, 1916, the Commissioner of Pensions reported officially that there were 353,034 Civil War invalid pensioners on the roll. Applying the ratio of 1 to 54, we would have as a result of this actual list 6,419 officers living on October 31, 1916, and deducting 90 for the deaths occurring in November and December there would be 6,320 living on December 31, 1916, according to this calculation.

From these three reliable, yet different, computations, we obtain the following results: The Loyal Legion estimate is 6,230; the Pennsylvania Association, 6,660; the pro rata count of actual pensioners makes the number 6,320.

Now, the Commissioner of Pensions on March 30, 1916, wrote a letter to Congressman Hay, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, submitting a tabular statement showing that there were on the pension rolls on February 29, 1916, 12,598 volunteer officers of the Civil War. How he obtained the number he does not state, and inasmuch as he has repeatedly said that he could not determine the matter, I am curious to know how he obtained this number. I am sure that he has simply made an estimate and that it is as wrong as was his former estimate that the Sherwood bill granting a general increase of pensions to all soldiers of the Civil War would cost \$75,000,000. In this regard, I quote from the testimony of Gen. SHERWOOD, given before the House Committee on January 29, 1914. He was speaking about this bill now before the Senate—

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think perhaps if the Senator will wait until I get through quoting this extract he will not want to ask the question which he evidently desires to put, because I imagine the subsequent portion will answer his query.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask the Senator a question in connection with a statement he has already made.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator says the prediction was that the cost of the Sherwood bill would be \$75,000,000 a year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. In regard to that I wish the Senator would wait until I get through with that branch of the subject and until I come to that question, when perhaps I shall answer it; but if I do not I shall be very glad to have the Senator again ask the question. I am quoting from Gen. SHERWOOD's testimony on this subject in reference to this very bill or a similar one which was before the House committee. This was in 1914. He said:

I do not know what the estimate of the department is, but I had some experience with the department on my so-called dollar-a-day pension bill. It was said on the floor of the House by authority of the Commissioner of Pensions that my bill would carry \$75,000,000, and after the bill passed, as a compromise between the Senate and House, it was stated in all the leading magazines and in all the papers in a series of articles written by Gen. Adams, of Massachusetts, that the bill would carry \$75,000,000. So only a few days ago, when I reported my first omnibus pension bill, I presented the official figures of the cost of that bill—

His general pension law—

and it was \$20,800,000; so that the difference between the estimate made by the Pension Office and certified to as being absolutely correct was the difference between \$75,000,000 and \$20,800,000, and the figures I gave on the floor of the House and printed in the Record only a few days ago have not been contradicted and can not be contradicted.

Now, I imagine the Senator wishes to ask me if I discriminate between the dollar-a-day pension bill and the bill as it was finally passed and became a law. I do.

Mr. BRYAN. The figures quoted by the Senator do not.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The figures quoted by the Senator were the figures officially given as to the dollar-a-day pension bill; but Gen. SHERWOOD said that after the bill passed, as it did pass, the department was repeatedly quoted as saying that it would cost \$75,000,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the department estimated that the Sherwood bill, as passed by the House, would cost in the first three years an average of \$58,000,000 a year. It was estimated that the bill as amended by the Senate, if passed, would cost an average of \$22,000,000 a year. Now, it is hardly fair to say that the Pension Bureau made a mistake of over \$55,000,000, as is inferred in the quotation read by the Senator, when the figures given do not apply to the situation which the Pension Bureau



had in mind at the time. That was the purpose I had in interrupting the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I recognize that—

Mr. BRYAN. The department's estimate of the amount that would have been carried by the dollar-a-day Sherwood pension bill was \$58,000,000, and no man can say whether that was an overestimate or an underestimate because that bill never became a law. As to the bill that did become a law, it was estimated by the department that it would cost about \$22,000,000 a year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And it cost \$20,000,000.

Mr. BRYAN. It cost \$20,800,000, according to the figures which the Senator read, which was a pretty close estimate; and those figures are not for the first year or two.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BRYAN. The figures the Senator read were not for the first year or two. Does the Senator know what the cost was for the first year under the Sherwood bill?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have read the statement from the testimony of the author of the bill before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

Mr. BRYAN. I am talking about what it cost, and I think that it cost the full amount estimated by the department.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Member from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, who was the author of the bill, made the statement which I have read in his testimony before the committee, in which he says that repeatedly the department stated that the bill would cost \$75,000,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. That is the reason I wanted to interrupt the Senator, to state that the bill introduced by Mr. SHERWOOD did not become a law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I said that.

Mr. BRYAN. And it is not fair to say that the department overestimated the expense of the bill \$50,000,000 a year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have not misstated the facts. I said all that the Senator has said; I had read the testimony of Gen. SHERWOOD, and I do not think there is any evidence to dispute the testimony as given by Gen. SHERWOOD on that occasion.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the facts dispute it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think so.

Mr. BRYAN. There is no occasion for a misunderstanding about that. Gen. Sherwood, according to the hearing from which the Senator has read, stated that the department claimed that the Sherwood bill would cost \$75,000,000. He said that, as a matter of fact, it cost \$20,800,000, and sought to draw the inference that the department had made that tremendous mistake in its estimate of over \$50,000,000, when the department was estimating upon a bill that never passed, which estimate no man, neither Gen. Sherwood nor anybody else, can demonstrate was wrong. The department's estimate of the cost of the bill that finally passed was very close to its actual cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think I am correct in saying that the average age of the veterans of the late Civil War is about 70 years at the present time. The officers were, as a rule, much older than the men in the ranks, and I will ask the Senator if I have read correctly in some publication that the officers for whose benefit this bill is intended average about 80 years?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator is correct. I do not think anybody disputes that fact.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that at best this burden, if it is a burden—I think it is an obligation, a duty—will not rest very long upon the Treasury if we pass this bill, as I apprehend we are going to do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the Senator is absolutely correct about that.

I should like to discuss a little further the question of the commissioner's estimate of the cost of this bill—that is, the estimate made by him as of February 20, 1916—in which he said that the net cost would be something over \$7,000,000, and that there were something over 12,000 living officers at that time, a year ago next February. That his figures are grossly incorrect an analysis of the situation will disclose. He states that there were 13,534 naval and military Regular and volunteer officers who served in the Civil War and on the pension

rolls February 29, 1916. He deducts 936 who are now receiving a pension or retired pay in excess of what this bill would give them, leaving 12,598 as the number who would be benefited by this proposed act.

On October 31, 1916, as I have stated, the commissioner made his official report, showing the total number of Civil War invalid pensioners, officers and privates, to be 353,034. Deducting from the total number 13,534 officers, as reported by him, we have 339,860 privates, or one officer for fewer than 26 men. When, however, the test case was made last year by actual count of the pension certificates examined for Col. Koch at the department it was found, as I have stated, that there was 1 officer for 54 privates, and that proportion was thought to be large by everyone familiar with the situation.

No man who employs his reason can accept the ratio of 1 to 25. The ratio of officers to men was not so large during the war and it has been growing less every year since. The officers averaged, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has said, from 5 to 10 years older than the privates. Their mortality has been necessarily greater, and it is not possible for me to believe that there can be living to-day more than 1 officer for 50 living privates. So if we apply the ratio of 1 to 50—and that is a very large ratio—to the last report of the commissioner, the total would be 6,665 officers living.

If my statement that there are now living fewer than 7,000 men who could be benefited by the bill, the next question to be determined is the additional cost to the Government which it would incur, and to determine it we must apply the provisions of the bill as to retired pay. And at the outset let it be understood that the pensioned officer who comes under its provisions will not thereafter draw his pension. In other words, retirement pay is in lieu of pension, and from the total amount carried by the bill must be deducted the amount now paid in pensions in order to obtain the actual net additional cost to the Government.

Now, in determining the total cost of the bill we must again use an approximation. The bill provides that officers of the Army and Navy who served in the Civil War for two years or more and were honorably discharged may be retired as of the highest rank held by them, on a payment for life of one-half the salary now paid to Regular Army officers of similar rank, and that the officer who served one year may be similarly paid one-quarter such salary, and those who served not less than six months may be paid one-eighth of such salary, but in no case can an officer be paid more than three-fourths of the initial pay of a captain in the Army. If we knew the exact number and length of service of all these officers, we could readily multiply and determine the total amount. But here again the records of the Grand Army of the Republic posts, the Loyal Legion commanderies, and the Pension Department have been employed to secure a reasonably correct result. The officers of highest rank are fewer in number and more readily determinable.

The initial salary of a captain in the Regular Army is \$2,400, and the maximum that any officer could receive under the bill is three-fourths a captain's salary, or three-fourths of \$2,400, which is \$1,800. Colonels and officers of higher rank than colonels who have served two years or more are the only men who will receive that sum. Officers below the rank of colonel who served two years or more receive one-half of the salary now paid to officers of equivalent rank in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and in every case one-half of such salary is less than \$1,800. Colonels and officers of higher rank than colonels who served one year would receive one-half as much as the officer of equivalent rank who served two years, or \$900, and colonels and officers of higher rank who served six months would receive one-fourth as much as the officer who served two years, or \$450.

Lieutenant colonels who served two years or more would receive one-half of the pay of lieutenant colonels to-day, or \$1,750. Lieutenant colonels who served one year would receive \$825. Lieutenant colonels who served six months would receive \$412.50.

A major who served two years would receive one-half of a major's salary to-day, which is \$3,000, or \$1,500. A major who served one year would receive one-half as much, or \$750, while a major who served six months would receive \$375.

A captain who served two years would receive one-half a captain's salary, which is \$2,400, or \$1,200. A captain who served one year would receive \$600, while a captain who served six months would receive \$300.

A first lieutenant's salary to-day is \$2,000. Under the bill a first lieutenant who served two years would receive one-half that amount, or \$1,000, and one who served one year would receive \$500, and one who served six months would receive \$250.



A second lieutenant who served two years would receive one-half of a second lieutenant's salary, which is \$1,700, or \$850, and those who served one year and those who served six months, respectively, would receive \$425 and \$212.50.

Col. C. R. E. Koch, chairman of the committee of volunteer officers, submitted a table to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House as of December 31, 1915, which showed that on that date there were approximately 144 colonels and generals living, 216 lieutenant colonels, 360 majors and officers equivalent to majors (surgeons and paymasters), 2,520 captains and officers of equivalent rank (assistant surgeons and chaplains), 2,304 first lieutenants and officers of equivalent rank (adjutants and quartermasters), and 1,656 second lieutenants, a total of 7,200 officers of all ranks.

Since that table was made on December 31, 1915, a year has elapsed, as I have stated, and the death toll has been at least 15 per cent. It is certain that at least 30 per cent of the colonels and generals have died. I have letters, I think, which mention several hundred deaths.

Now, just what length of time each officer served it is impossible to determine, but from the figures which have been presented by the department as well as those furnished by the different Loyal Legion commanderies and Grand Army posts it is safe and fair to suppose that much the larger number served two years or more and therefore would be entitled to the maximum pay under the bill. It is also absolutely certain that the number of who would draw \$1,800, the maximum provided for any officer, would be small. It is also true that the retired pay of captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants who had served but six months would be less than the amount of pension which they are now receiving, and therefore, except for the distinction which comes from official recognition, there would be no inducement for these short-term men to come under the provisions of the bill. If they did come, however, it would be at a sacrifice in pension or pay, and to that extent at least the bill would induce a saving rather than an additional expenditure. For instance, a captain who served but six months under this bill would receive but \$300 a year, a first lieutenant but \$250, and a second lieutenant but \$212.50, and yet it is undoubtedly true that a majority of them, if not all, are now drawing \$30 a month, or \$360 annually. There are probably in the neighborhood of 2,000 captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants who served a year, and their pay under the bill would be, respectively, \$600 for captains, \$500 for first lieutenants, and \$425 for second lieutenants, or, in other words, such captains would receive \$240 a year more than they are now receiving, first lieutenants \$140 more, and second lieutenants \$65 additional over what they are now receiving in pensions.

I do not believe that there ever was a more conscientious set of men working upon any problem before Congress than have been the volunteer officers' committees who have devoted their time and attention in order to arrive at the actual cost of the measure. I am satisfied that their work is approximately correct. My own judgment is that the bill will not cost to exceed \$3,000,000 the first year and that it will be from 12 to 20 per cent less the second, and the decrease thereafter will be even greater. Under no circumstances can the additional cost created by this bill over and above what is now paid for pensions equal \$5,000,000. That it will be much less than that is indicated by the excessive estimates made by the Pension Department in all previous years when pension bills have been before Congress.

I repeat that the death rate among the officers is appalling. The hundreds of letters which come to me from various parts of the United States, giving the physical and financial condition of officers who were once the pride as well as the salvation of the country, have touched me very deeply, and I have felt that it was a disgrace to our Government to allow this condition to exist longer. With the utmost expedition possible in passing the measure through both Houses of Congress scores of these worthy, patriotic men will have passed beyond its benefits.

There certainly can be no legitimate charge made that this movement is political in its nature and designed to distribute benefits for political advantage. These old men, now averaging, as I have stated, at least 79 years of age, have passed the time when they are great political factors in the affairs of the country. They have entered the "sear and yellow leaf" period; and while this bill would bring a degree of comfort to a great majority of them who are now recipients of public institutions, and all of them would feel that they could close their eyes to earth more hopefully if they felt that their posterity could know that sacred promises made in war were not simply scraps of paper, but that patriotism and sacrifice were recognized as its essential fundamental principles by the Republic which they preserved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is well for us, if we can, to reach a reasonably accurate estimate as to the cost of this proposed legislation. We have the report of the Pension Office and of an Acting Secretary of the Interior Department. The estimate of the department was that if this bill had been passed in 1914 the first year's charge upon the Treasury would have been \$9,208,159.89. This estimate of the department, the Secretary states, is based upon an estimate made upon a similar bill introduced April 8, 1913. The estimate by the department for the first year on this first bill placed the net cost at \$10,283,122 for the first year. The letter of the Secretary declares that the factors used in ascertaining this amount were 16,472 officers then surviving, as determined by deduction on account of percentages of loss by death from a number theretofore found by actual count to be living and borne on the pension rolls. So that the estimates of the department began with an actual count, as stated by the Secretary, and proceeded with deductions based upon estimates. This last deduction allowed 8 per cent deduction for one year, but it made the figures for the year following the spring of 1914, or for the fiscal year 1914-15, as I understand, \$9,208,159.89.

According to this estimate, under the present bill the first year's charge upon the Treasury would be between seven and eight millions of dollars. But the Senator from Michigan (Mr. TOWNSEND) doubts the accuracy of estimates by the department, and quotes from a speech of a Member of the House with reference to prior estimates. Mr. President, it need not be a matter of dispute as to what the department estimated with reference to the Sherwood bill, which was before us a few years ago. The Senator from Florida (Mr. BRYAN) states definitely that the estimate of the department for the Sherwood bill as it passed the House was that for the first year it would cost \$58,000,000. We know the accuracy of the Senator from Florida, and we know what attention he gave to this subject. We have sent out now and are endeavoring to obtain a copy of the report of the department at that time. We know that fortunately for the country that bill as it passed the House was substantially amended in the Senate, and that the Sherwood bill as passed by the House never became law. Now the Senator from Florida states that the estimate of the department as to the first year's cost of the bill which we actually passed was \$22,000,000, which was practically correct. Why, Mr. President, for a Member of the House or of the Senate to undertake to assail the estimates of the department by loosely charging that the department estimated that a bill which we passed would cost \$75,000,000 annually, and therefore that estimates of the department can not be relied upon, is for the Senator or the Member of the House to be quite careless in his statements, and very inaccurate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do; but I wish to assure the Senator from Michigan that it is not prearranged upon my part, for I would gladly go on.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Daniels for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Hardwick	Oliver	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Overman	Smoot
Bryan	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones	Pittman	Stone
Chilton	Kenyon	Poinexter	Sutherland
Clark	Kern	Ransdell	Swanson
Culberson	Lane	Reed	Thomas
Cummins	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thompson
Curtis	Lodge	Shafroth	Tilman
Dillingham	McCumber	Sheppard	Townsend
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Underwood
Gofe	Nelson	Simmons	Wadsworth
Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh
Harding	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Weeks

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained on account of illness, and will not be able to be with the Senate to-day. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]. They are both detained on official business.



Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent, and he understands that he is absent by leave of the Senate. If there is any mistake about that, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that he be granted leave of absence during his illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a matter which it is not possible to look after at this time. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The Senator from Nevada moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TOWNSEND. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], who I understand is absent from the Senate. As I understand that upon this question he would vote as I shall vote, I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LEWIS (when his name was called). I beg to announce that I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] upon the main question of the confirmation or not of Mr. Daniels. Not knowing how he would vote on this executive session, I beg to withhold my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called.) The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent, but is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted when my name was called. I desire now to announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He being absent, I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and will allow my vote to stand. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. I withdraw the announcement made a moment ago of the transfer of my pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and transfer it to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WEEKS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I inadvertently voted, as he is absent. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]; and

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 26, as follows:

#### YEAS—29.

Bryan	Kern	Reed	Stone
Chamberlain	Lane	Saulsbury	Swanson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thomas
Culberson	Newlands	Sheppard	Underwood
Gore	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Hardwick	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	
Hitchcock	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	
Hughes	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	

#### NAYS—26.

Borah	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	Nelson	Sterling
Brandeggee	Harding	Norris	Sutherland
Clark	Jones	Oliver	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Page	Works
Curtis	Lodge	Polindexter	
Dillingham	McCumber	Sherman	

#### NOT VOTING—40.

Ashurst	Goff	McLean	Thompson
Bankhead	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Tillman
Beckham	Husting	Myers	Vardaman
Broussard	James	O'Gorman	Wadsworth
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Warren
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Watson
Colt	Kirby	Phelan	Weeks
du Pont	La Follette	Robinson	Williams
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Shields	
Fernald	Lewis	Smith, Mich.	
Fletcher	Lippitt	Smith, S. C.	

So the motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 2 hours and 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 3, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 2, 1917.*

##### UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

William Denman, of San Francisco, Cal., to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of six years.

Bernard N. Baker, of Baltimore, Md., to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of five years.

John A. Donald, of New York City, to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of four years.

James B. White, of Kansas City, Mo., to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of three years.

Theodore Brent, of New Orleans, La., to be a member of the United States Shipping Board for a term of two years.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Thomas U. Raymond, Medical Corps, to be colonel from December 18, 1916, vice Col. Henry S. T. Harris, who died December 17, 1916.

Maj. Clarence J. Manly, Medical Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from December 18, 1916, vice Lieut. Col. Thomas U. Raymond, promoted.

Capt. Henry C. Pillsbury, Medical Corps, to be major from December 18, 1916, vice Maj. Clarence J. Manly, promoted.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### CALIFORNIA.

Lucius R. Barrow to be postmaster at San Diego, Cal., in place of C. H. Bartholomew. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1916.

Frederick Donaghy to be postmaster at Universal City, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank J. Kolash to be postmaster at Norwalk, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### DELAWARE.

Grover C. Gregg to be postmaster at Yorklyn, Del. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

##### ILLINOIS.

Ardelia M. Field to be postmaster at Dietrich, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John D. Harpole to be postmaster at Nebo, Ill. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Drew Tufts to be postmaster at Centralia, Ill., in place of Max H. Prill, removed.

##### INDIANA.

Frankie L. Allen to be postmaster at Clayton, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Andy E. Smith to be postmaster at Wolcott, Ind., in place of Robert F. Dobbins, deceased.



Marquis D. Yotter to be postmaster at Silverlake, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## KANSAS.

William Barrett to be postmaster at Pratt, Kans., in place of C. A. Hopper, resigned.

## KENTUCKY.

W. T. Dudgeon to be postmaster at Walton, Ky. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Richard F. Neely to be postmaster at Franklin, Ky., in place of Emmett S. Robey, resigned.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Edward L. Harkins to be postmaster at Shirley, Mass., in place of Kate E. Hazen. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1915.

## MICHIGAN.

Verd H. Carpenter to be postmaster at Central Lake, Mich., in place of F. R. Wallbrecht, deceased.

## MAINE.

John L. Donohue to be postmaster at Rockland, Me., in place of D. M. Murphy, deceased.

Thomas M. Nichols to be postmaster at Jackman, Me. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## MINNESOTA.

John A. Eastlund to be postmaster at Kennedy, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Robert B. Forrest to be postmaster at Lake Wilson, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank H. Griffin to be postmaster at Good Thunder, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Fred E. Joslyn to be postmaster at Mantorville, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Martin McGuire to be postmaster at Claremont, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

William E. Murphy to be postmaster at Holdingford, Minn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles A. Stewart to be postmaster at Howard Lake, Minn., in place of Enoch E. Ritchie, resigned.

## MISSOURI.

Aubra M. Green to be postmaster at Armstrong, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Clifford E. Miller to be postmaster at Verona, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Clyde A. Perkins to be postmaster at Barnard, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Goldie Wilson to be postmaster at Parnell, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NEBRASKA.

Hertha L. Mershon to be postmaster at Wilcox, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NEW JERSEY.

George M. Keebler to be postmaster at Glassboro, N. J., in place of Thomas M. Ferrell, deceased.

## NEW YORK.

Raymond J. Carden to be postmaster at Mountain Dale, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Michael Culligan to be postmaster at Wurtsboro, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Francis O. Driscoll to be postmaster at Staten Island (late Tompkinsville), N. Y., in place of Mary L. McRoberts, to change name of office.

Oscar M. Grubb to be postmaster at Kennedy, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Thomas M. Keegan to be postmaster at Ferndale, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Patrick H. Townsend to be postmaster at Essex, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George E. Wroten to be postmaster at Trudeau, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

J. N. Fuquay to be postmaster at Lillington, N. C., in place of J. E. Ligon, removed.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Walter W. Lee to be postmaster at Sykeston, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Emil F. Neumann to be postmaster at Gackle, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John W. Stevenson to be postmaster at Flasher, N. Dak., in place of J. R. Krueger, resigned.

## OHIO.

Charles J. Quelette to be postmaster at Shepard, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## OKLAHOMA.

W. A. Byrne to be postmaster at Hartshorne, Okla., in place of Jasper P. Grady. Incumbent's position expired August 16, 1916.

Mark J. Courtney to be postmaster at Copan, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Clark L. Hussey to be postmaster at Tipton, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Robert M. Mowntcastle to be postmaster at Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of Bertha M. Nash, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

George L. Anderson to be postmaster at Avondale, Pa., in place of Anne D. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired July 13, 1916.

Nettie Beatty to be postmaster at Beatty, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Isaac P. Boogar to be postmaster at Oaks, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Jacob H. Gallmoyer to be postmaster at Topton, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George B. Kirk to be postmaster at South Brownsville, Pa., in place of Wesley B. McAlpine, resigned.

C. M. McGinnis to be postmaster at Genesee, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Miles L. Ritter to be postmaster at Newport, Pa., in place of John S. Leiby, resigned.

Margaret E. Taylor to be postmaster at Orbisonia, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Alvin L. Wenzel to be postmaster at Webster, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Jessie R. Wilson to be postmaster at St. Benedict, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

William McFarland to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, S. Dak., in place of Fred C. Bowles. Incumbent's commission expired July 16, 1916.

Mary A. Pike to be postmaster at Tyndall, S. Dak., in place of M. E. McCormick, resigned.

## TENNESSEE.

Luther M. Roberts to be postmaster at Soddy, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Patrick H. Toomey to be postmaster at Englewood, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## TEXAS.

Carrie M. Brooks to be postmaster at McCaulley, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Frank Farrington to be postmaster at Diboll, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

A. W. Melton to be postmaster at Bellevue, Tex., in place of A. A. Weeks, resigned.

## VERMONT.

George N. Clark to be postmaster at Groton, Vt. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Charles S. Dole to be postmaster at Danville, Vt. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## VIRGINIA.

Benjamin W. Council to be postmaster at Holland, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George E. Honts to be postmaster at Eagle Rock, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John L. T. Sneed to be postmaster at Gordonsville, Va., in place of Gertrude Blakey, resigned.

John A. Whitelaw to be postmaster at Monterey, Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## WASHINGTON.

Oscar W. Behrmann to be postmaster at Fairfield, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Richard Nagle to be postmaster at Marcus, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward H. Shanklin to be postmaster at Union, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

## WISCONSIN.

Charles J. Anderson to be postmaster at Clayton, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

Harry Bradley to be postmaster at Taylor, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.



Alphonse R. Eichman to be postmaster at Trempealeau, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

F. W. Mitchell to be postmaster at Ogema, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

John E. Nolan to be postmaster at Reedsville, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

George L. Reed to be postmaster at Darien, Wis. Office became presidential October 1, 1916.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 2, 1917.*

##### SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY OR LEGATION.

###### CLASS 4.

Herbert S. Gould to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

Livingston Phelps to be a secretary of embassy or legation of class 4.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

William Hitz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

##### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Justin McC. Miller to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Boatswain James E. Quirk to be a chief boatswain.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:

Robert G. Greenleaf and

James MacIntyre.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Orlando H. Petty,

Charles D. Shannon,

Raymond W. McNealy,

Warren F. Pearce,

Rudolph D. Joldersma, and

Bertram L. Cunningham.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Francis D. Pryor to be a lieutenant.

Ensign Walter E. Doyle to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Frank Hindrelet and

August Schulze.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### CONNECTICUT.

Frank O. Davis, Pomfret Center.

###### NEW MEXICO.

C. L. Loughridge, Gallup.

###### OKLAHOMA.

W. L. M. Burton, Shamrock.

Walter R. Franklin, McLoud.

Henry S. Howell, Mill Creek.

M. F. Landon, Lehigh.

Clifford P. Martin, McCurtain.

Cora M. Murdock, Oilton.

Lillian M. Newhouse, Pryor.

J. P. Renfrew, Alva.

Charles H. Roosevelt, Verden.

C. C. Speakman, Wellston.

Robert H. Speck, Vici.

Millie D. Swift, Bigheart.

Sam Swinney, Durant.

J. W. Westbrook, Ada.

Vida E. Woolverton, Redrock.

###### PENNSYLVANIA.

Isaac H. Albright, Cochranville.

David H. Caldwell, Manor.

Mary A. Jefferis, Wynnewood.

Joseph C. McCormick, Marion Center.

John J. McCoy, Crum Lynne.

Chester A. Moore, Howard.

Harry F. Moyer, Robesonia.

Sylvester W. Smith, Center Hall.

J. Hayes Turner, Lincoln University.

Robert P. Whitman, Schwenkville.

Murray D. Zechman, Sinking Spring.

###### SOUTH CAROLINA.

William B. Blakeley, Andrews.

George A. Bessellieu, Meggett.

Lewis B. Freeman, Paris Island.

John A. Patjens, Mount Pleasant.

Hattie J. Peeples, Varnville.

Grover L. Smith, Springfield.

#### TENNESSEE.

S. H. Allen, Petersburg.

Charles R. Brumley, Mascot.

Leon Caraway, Big Sandy.

Willis H. Claxton, Stanton.

Thomas Lee Fowlkes, Ridgely.

J. B. Gilbert, Huntingdon.

Henry E. Hudson, Whitwell.

Mary Coker Parker, Mont Eagle.

York A. Quillen, Bullsgap.

Clyde E. Smith, Rutledge.

James B. Sugg, Adams.

Mary A. Varnell, Altonpark.

Perry B. West, Lafayette.

#### WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn January 2, 1917.*

Capt. Edward M. Shinkle, Coast Artillery Corps (major, Ordnance Department), for appointment by transfer as captain of Field Artillery.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*TUESDAY, January 2, 1917.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit our Heavenly Father, that through the dispensation of Thy providence we have been brought to the beginning of a new year. The past with its experiences, its mistakes and achievements, its defeats and victories, its accumulated knowledge and wisdom is ours by inheritance, if we will. The future looms before us with its perplexing problems, great possibilities, and hidden issues.

Give us wisdom, strength, courage, and fortitude to go forward with renewed faith and with brave and manly hearts remembering that we are not bound to succeed, but we are bound to try and leave the results to Thine infinite wisdom, power, and goodness.

Grant, O we beseech Thee, that the nations now engaged in war may find a happy solution of all their differences, and that out of the turmoil, suffering, and sorrow a light may shine which shall guide us to a lasting peace; that the bonds of brotherhood may never again be broken under the spiritual guidance of our Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 22, 1916, was read and approved.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. OAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 10 days' leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. GLYNN, of Connecticut, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. GLYNN, may be excused for 10 days on account of illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. LOBECK for one week on account of illness.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the question of the international commerce commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the international commerce commission. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. By inserting a lot of stuff, or the gentleman's own able remarks?

Mr. RAKER. There will be but a few of my able remarks, and the bulk of it will be the remarks of Mr. David Lubin, of Sacramento, Cal., whom we know, and who is a man of great learning upon this subject and who has spent many years upon it.

Mr. MANN. Is that the document which has just been received through the mail and has been printed by Senator FLETCHER?

Mr. RAKER. This has nothing to do with Senator FLETCHER. This is Mr. Lubin's own statement.

Mr. MANN. But Senator FLETCHER just printed a statement of David Lubin.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana objects.



Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of House bill 15852, a bill to lay an embargo upon print paper, pulp, and its products.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of an embargo upon print paper, wood pulp, and so forth. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a newspaper statement made by me upon the result of the recent congressional election in my district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BRITT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a newspaper article written by himself, touching the recent congressional election in his district. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. A Member of the House ought to have the opportunity to make a statement in reference to an election in his district.

Mr. GARRETT. Let me understand clearly what it is.

Mr. MANN. It is a statement which the gentleman from North Carolina has written in reference to the election recently held in his district.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial from the Ocala (Fla.) Banner upon the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial upon the subject of public buildings. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the military highway bill, which I recently introduced, and also the remarks of others in relation to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the military highway bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

By direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, Mr. MOON reported the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (No. 1249), ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota reserves all points of order.

#### RESIGNATION OF MR. QUEZON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, transmitting a letter of resignation of MANUEL L. QUEZON, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, December 28, 1916.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,  
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith an official copy of a letter addressed to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands by Hon. MANUEL L. QUEZON, under date of October 15, 1916, in which he tenders his resignation as Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands to the United States.

Sincerely, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER, Secretary of War.

MANILA, October 15, 1916.

Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON,  
Governor General of the Philippines, Manila.

DEAR GOVERNOR GENERAL: I beg hereby to tender my resignation as Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands in the United States.

In this capacity I have served my country for seven years, and for the last three I have been fortunate enough to receive the whole-hearted cooperation of the administration of the Philippine Islands.

I am indebted to you for life. Without your cordial and decided support it would have been impossible for me to accomplish anything in the very difficult mission entrusted to me by my people. I want to

leave to posterity this public testimony of my deep appreciation of what you have done for the people of the Philippines. They owe you something that they can never in this world repay. You have been in part their liberator. History will yet give you full credit for the unselfish and patriotic devotion to the noble task you have been called upon to perform in these islands. You were sent here as the representative of the Government of the United States, and as such it has been your paramount duty to show us in deeds the ideals of your country, how we are regarded by your people, and what they propose to do by us. You have done your duty. We are now convinced that your country stands for freedom for all; that we are regarded by your people with paternal care, and that they will go to any extent to secure for ourselves and for our children the blessings of democracy. As you have endeavored to relax and have succeeded in relaxing the political ties between your country and mine you have become the bond of everlasting friendly union between your people and my people. You have earned our love and admiration. You are entitled to the recognition of your own Government and of your own people.

Personally you have been very kind to me. You have proven to be my true friend. You know that I am yours for ever.

Very cordially,

MANUEL L. QUEZON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes upon the subject of public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes upon the subject of public buildings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article which I send to the Clerk's desk be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the newspaper clipping.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Ocala (Fla.) Banner, Dec. 30, 1916.]

FRANK CLARK, "THE GETTER."

The big newspapers of the country are hammering FRANK CLARK because he believes that the Public Treasury is a national affair and does not belong solely and exclusively to the big cities.

The Brooklyn Eagle, for example, says:

"Representative FRANK CLARK, of the second district of Florida, which has a population, exclusive of tourists, of approximately 200,000, is chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds."

Because his district is so small the Brooklyn Eagle seems to be possessed of the idea that FRANK CLARK has got no business being in Congress, and, in its opinion, it goes without saying that he has no business being chairman of so important a committee as the one on Public Buildings and Grounds.

In the opinion of the Eagle, the chairmanships of important committees should be the especial inheritance of the Members of Congress from our larger cities, which are supposed to be the depositaries of all intelligence and culture.

Then the Eagle goes out of its way to slander our State in the following fashion:

"But we must come back to Mr. CLARK, 'the getter.' He must not be too severely condemned. Environment has a lot to do with the spirit of getting. Florida is full of environment. In fact, it has more of it to the square mile than any State in the Union. Cynics have said that Florida's population is equally divided between those with the money and those after it. When there is a scarcity of the former, the latter seems to increase. It is an endless chain. What the east coast system takes from the rich it must defend against the onslaught of politicians, whose eagerness may account for the fact that the State legislature meets biennially and sessions are limited to 60 days. What is more natural than that Florida's Representatives in Congress should make most of a limitless opportunity?"

The editor of this paper has traveled just a little bit. He has visited Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Cincinnati, Chicago, and many of the larger cities of the country, and in all of which his heart thrilled and swelled with pride and patriotism as he beheld the splendor and adornments of their Federal buildings. He could well imagine that in grandeur and architectural beauty they put to the blush Solomon's temple and the palace of the Caesars.

They cost millions upon top of millions, but never a word has he heard uttered that it was a wasteful extravagance of the Nation's money. These magnificent structures, costing millions merely for their sculptural figures and other ornamentalations, carry with them no taint of the "pork barrel."

It is only when a rural population of a few thousand souls secures a Federal appropriation amounting to a few thousand dollars that the "pork barrel" cry is heard.

On all occasions these big cities act the hog.

They reserve the right to themselves to loot the Public Treasury.

If rigid economy and simplicity is to prevail, why erect any Federal buildings costing five and ten and more millions of dollars?

The business of the country can be done in buildings without any architectural frills and furbelows just as satisfactorily as in one with marble columns, mural decorations, and golden domes that glitter in the sunlight.

Neither do those newspapers in the big cities across the line complain of the millions appropriated for the improvements of their harbors.

The "tainted" cry of "pork" is only heard when an appropriation is asked for some building, river, or harbor in some rural localities, where the population is supposed to pay the toll and be content.

No wonder FRANK CLARK arose in his seat and in his wrath, in answer to one of his critics, said:

"That is an absolute, bald, unsupported, snaggle-toothed, and unqualified falsehood."

His language was not very parliamentary, but was no more than the occasion demanded.

The Government should not be niggardly or parsimonious. It should erect a Federal building in every incorporated city and town in the



United States, and in architectural design and finish it should set the pace. These buildings would cultivate the taste and accentuate the patriotism of the people. They would give them a broader vision of the grandeur and glory of our Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### POSTAL RATES.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the zone system of postal rates for newspapers and magazines.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the zone system of postal rates for newspapers and magazines. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, are these the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman's own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the vocational education bill (S. 703), and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 10 days be granted to the Members of the House for the purpose of printing their speeches in the RECORD upon this subject.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the latter part of the request, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] if it is his hope to complete the consideration of this bill to-day?

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the gentleman that all general debate on this bill has been concluded, and the bill is up now under the five-minute rule and we certainly expect to complete it to-day.

Mr. LEVER. In view of that statement, I will not make another motion. The Agricultural appropriation bill is ready for consideration, but I myself am in favor of this bill and will be glad for the gentleman to complete it to-day.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] intend to take up the Agricultural appropriation bill on Thursday after the conclusion of the Niagara bill?

Mr. LEVER. I do if I can get recognition.

Mr. MANN. Suppose that this bill should be completed early to-day?

Mr. LEVER. Then I shall hope to go on to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 703), and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen have leave to print remarks on the bill for 10 legislative days.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think I will object to the request for 10 days in which to print remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the vocational-education bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education, etc., with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 703, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, the trades, industries, and home economics; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to authorize the appropriation of money and to regulate its expenditure.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. When we last adjourned the House bill had been offered as a substitute for the Senate bill, but had not been disposed of. Now the House bill, the substitute, as I understand, is open for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that by unanimous consent the bill, S. 703, was stricken out and the text of the House bill (H. R. 11250) substituted therefor.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My question is whether that substitute is now subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Under the five-minute rule and under the ordinary rules of the House it is subject to amendment by section.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement that was made this substitute is to be treated as an original bill, read section by section, and each section open to amendment as read.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair and the Clerk will read the text of the House bill.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if my request is correct, the first section of the House bill has already been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The first section of the Senate bill was read.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. And we will now proceed to read the House bill?

The CHAIRMAN. We will now proceed to read the House bill, commencing with section 1.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I desire to offer an amendment to section 1 when it is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums provided in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, to be paid to the respective States for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, and teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and in the preparation of teachers of agricultural, trade, industrial, and home economics subjects; and the sum provided for in section 7 for the use of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the administration of this act and for the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports to aid in the organization and conduct of vocational education, which sums shall be expended as herein-after provided.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by inserting at the end of line 7, on page 2, the following:

*"Provided, That all sums accepted by and paid to any State shall, by the State board controlling its expenditures, be equitably distributed in all parts or sections of the State, so far as it may be possible and practicable to do it under the provisions of this act."*

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment as a friend of the bill, and its purpose is to try to make more specific and, if possible, more certain the fair distribution of the benefits of the measure that are intended by its author and friends.

Assuming that this bill becomes a law and that its provisions are accepted by all of the 48 States of the Union, and that the funds as herein provided are distributed among the States as proposed, the State of Missouri, from which I come, will, it is estimated, receive in 10 years \$1,553,980. This sum when duplicated by the State will amount to \$3,107,960.

According to the latest information I have been able to obtain we have in Missouri 923,963 children of school age and 9,873 public schools and 584 public high schools. Of course, it will not be possible for every pupil in the State to receive his or her share of the proposed appropriation, nor will it be possible for every public school in the State to receive its proportionate share of this fund, as the average annual amount to the average public school would be only about \$31 per annum, which would be so reduced in amount as to be of little value if distributed in that way, but the average annual rate to the high schools of the State if equally distributed would amount to \$532 per annum. So that it seems to me that it will probably be desirable to expend this fund in the normal schools, the high schools, and such of the other public schools as are prepared to give instructions in the branches provided for in the bill, but in any event it can and ought to be so distributed as to reach every section of the State and to be helpful to all the boys and girls of every quarter of the country who are striving for or desirous of obtaining vocational training along the lines proposed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. What has the gentleman in his mind as to how they can distribute this money equitably throughout the State? For example, does the gentleman propose in the first place to distribute this money equitably throughout a State?



Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My amendment provides that it shall be the duty of the boards in every State to distribute the money that goes to each State equitably over that State.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would, then, try to instruct the boards to give this character of education in every school throughout the State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Oh, no; but that the money should be distributed throughout the State equitably, so as to carry a part of its benefits to all parts of the State and avoid the possible danger of its being concentrated in a few places to the exclusion of other parts of the State.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think that if the money expended is going to be of any use it must be concentrated to the extent of having an efficient organization wherever they are going to teach these vocational branches?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think so; but if the gentleman will read my amendment he will find it provides that it shall be distributed by the States, so far as it can practically be done under the provisions of this bill, so that the purposes of the bill will in nowise be destroyed.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman suggest it shall be the duty of the board to administer it in a particular section of a State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The bill provides that it shall be distributed in proportion to population among the States. I take it that the same principle should be followed of distributing it equitably throughout the State. I know that there is some apprehension on that ground. Some fear that if the money is appropriated and paid to States it may go to a few sections of the several States and the other sections be neglected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. Who is to be the judge—the Federal board or the State board—as to the equitable distribution?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The State board; but I understand their actions in all cases will be supervised by and subject to the approval of the Federal board, but it should be the duty of the State board to try at least to make a fair distribution of the funds.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I just wanted to make an observation upon what my colleague had stated.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. When I get through. The gentleman does not want to do so in my time, I hope.

Mr. FESS. No.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if the effect of his amendment would not be to take this appropriation out of the control of the Federal board?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Not at all; because the bill itself is not interfered with in the least, and the other provisions of this bill provide that the members of the Federal board shall supervise the entire matter.

Mr. WALSH. But this is in conflict with the other provisions of the bill, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think not. This amendment says, "In so far as it is practicable under the provisions of this bill." It is not intended to interfere with its other provisions.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. We have attempted in this bill not to affect the economy of the States. We have guarded that in every possible feature. It is assumed that this board, which is to be constituted under the provisions of the bill in each State, shall best understand how to distribute this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask the gentleman if the State board provided for in this bill would not have better information as to the plan of distribution of this money to the schools, and so

forth, which must be submitted to this Federal board for their approval?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I think perhaps that is true. I think that what the gentleman from Georgia suggests is true, but at the same time I think that an amendment like this, incorporated in the bill, would have a good influence upon the State boards and possibly induce them to make greater efforts to secure the fair distribution of the funds throughout a State.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to my distinguished friend that the committee tried not to be captious at all in the drawing of this bill and tried to devote itself to the great principles promulgated in this bill. We felt that we could not go into the minor details. We felt that those should be left to the States, to these State boards, and we discussed this principle and this very question before the committee; and the committee was of the unanimous opinion that this bill carried just what the gentleman really expected and wanted.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The gentleman from Georgia understands that I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I am very glad to know that that is true. Yes; I know it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I am prepared to give it my hearty support, whether this amendment is adopted or not. But I do know that there is some apprehension in my State that when the money is sent there by the Federal Government it may be concentrated in a few sections or parts of the State. I can not see that the amendment I have offered can do any harm, because it provides that whatever is done shall be done in accordance with the provisions of the bill. It is simply an instruction to the boards of the State that they shall try, as far as practicable, under the provisions of the bill, to fairly distribute the money throughout the State, and would clearly show our intention and understanding when we vote to pass it.

Mr. HUGHES. Should not that be left to the board that is created under this bill? This is taking from them, I think, no rights that they ought to have. It is a suggestion by Congress, by passing this law, how Congress feels the money should be expended.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Yes. I yield to my colleague with pleasure.

Mr. BORLAND. I observe that by the bill \$500,000 is appropriated for agricultural education and \$500,000 for industrial education.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. It is divided into three parts.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. Now, \$500,000 distributed among the States would be only \$10,000 distributed throughout each State, and \$10,000 more for industrial work, which is separate, however. Now, under a State such as ours, with 114 counties in it, it strikes me it would be hardly practicable to use \$10,000, the first experimental appropriation, very widely over a State. It seems to me it would be necessary to concentrate that \$10,000 somewhere where results would appear. If the appropriation were larger, it might be expanded. If we made it compulsory that the money should be distributed throughout the State, the money itself would not go very far among 114 counties.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. My amendment provides that—

So far as it may be possible and practicable to do under the provisions of this act.

If it is not practicable to divide it over all parts of the State, of course, under my amendment, they would not be required to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. Then this amendment is simply an expression of opinion on the part of Congress, and does not compel the board to distribute the money over the entire State?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Only so far as practicable under the provisions of this bill, expressing to the State boards the feeling of Congress upon that question.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, then, it is an expression from the Members of Congress. The State board can do as they please with the fund, anyway.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why does the gentleman think the State educational organizations can not be trusted to make a fair and equitable distribution of this contribution?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I do not know. I guess they can be trusted, but I know that there is a controversy going on now in my State as to how the money appropriated under the road law we passed shall be divided. There are some people in that State who now favor expending it all on a few roads, and many people in other parts of the State are afraid they may not get their share. It seems to me that it will be entirely proper for this Congress to express its feeling as to how the money should be expended.



I congratulate the author of this bill for his good intentions that led him to prepare and to introduce it, and likewise I commend the several members of the Committee on Education who have participated in perfecting and reporting it to the House for its consideration. Its purposes are praiseworthy, and I hope and believe its practical operation will be very useful to a great many individuals, and of great benefit to the country at large.

After being called upon at the last session of this Congress to vote for more than \$843,000,000 to sustain the military arm of the Government, including pensions for service in past wars, and since observing the invitation contained in the estimates now submitted, to vote at this session for more than \$892,000,000 for military purposes, amounting together to more than \$1,735,000,000 in the two sessions of the Sixty-fourth Congress, it is with a feeling of genuine pleasure and a delightful relief to be given the opportunity to-day to vote for an appropriation like this without associating with its expenditure the contemplation of bloodshed, misery, and death.

This bill proposes within the next 10 years to expend about \$45,000,000 in training the boys and girls of our land for useful civil pursuits that will promote their own success and happiness in the world and at the same time benefit humanity.

In my opinion it is one of the most meritorious bills considered by this House in either session of this Congress. I hope my amendment will be agreed to, and that the bill will be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter from Prof. W. S. Dearmont, president of the State Normal School at Cape Girardeau, Mo., giving very convincing reasons why this bill should be passed, and urging me to give it my support.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to above is as follows:

MISSOURI STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,  
Cape Girardeau, Mo., January 13, 1916.

Hon. J. J. RUSSELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: I have to ask another favor of you, in addition to the many that you have granted. I am informed indirectly through the Hon. HOKE SMITH, Senator from Georgia and chairman of the Commission for National Aid to Vocational Education, that the commission's bill will be reintroduced in the present Congress, in the Senate and House, and that strong efforts will be made to secure the passage of this measure offering national aid to vocational education.

I have read the commission's report very carefully and the bill as introduced in the last Congress. I feel sure that the measure of national aid proposed in this bill is very much needed. This is especially true in the Southern States, and the commission's own investigations and thoroughly reliable investigations made by other commissions and associations show that there are at the present time in the United States fully 2,000,000 boys and girls between 14 and 16 or 17 years old who are undertaking to earn a livelihood in various employments without having received an education that will make it possible for many of them ever to become self-supporting citizens. In other words, these 2,000,000 boys and girls for lack of a proper education are wholly unable to increase their earning capacity and to advance themselves in life to the position of self-supporting and self-respecting citizens. These 2,000,000 boys and girls must at best remain throughout life on the border line between self-supporting and self-respecting citizens and the great body of the submerged classes who are always more or less dependent upon society for their support. No doubt a very large proportion of them will fall into the ranks of helpless pauperism, and many of them will enter the ranks of the criminal classes.

Unless more adequate provisions can be made for the better education of the working classes in this country, this large body of our people, who are absolutely unable to become self-respecting and self-supporting citizens without better educational opportunities, must continue to grow still larger from year to year. Many of the communities in which there is this lack of educational facilities could no doubt supply the need for themselves. In many other communities it is well-nigh impossible for the local communities to meet this need fully. Under the circumstances it seems to me that it is only wise and proper that, knowing all the conditions so fully, the Congress of the United States should come to the aid of the States, for the present at least, and, through the bill recommended by the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, furnish part of the money needed in order that the several States and local communities may be brought to realize the importance of this work and may be moved to join with the United States Government in providing for the more adequate education of this large body of boys and girls whose needs at present are being neglected.

We hear very much just now of the need of "preparedness" on the part of the people of the United States to meet certain possible future contingencies. I think that if the great war in Europe has taught one lesson more strongly than another, it is the fact that the best possible preparation that a nation can make, for war even, is to develop its people to the highest possible degree in their industrial efficiency. Industrially, I think the most efficient people on earth to-day, perhaps, are the Germans and the French; and the industrial efficiency of these people has not only contributed to the national wealth, so necessary in war, but has contributed very largely to the ability of both the Germans and the French to manufacture the necessary war munitions and armaments, and no doubt the skilled mechanics of the Germans and the French, even without previous military training, can be very readily trained for duty as soldiers in time of need. Personally I feel that better industrial education and more specific preparation for industrial efficiency for all our people constitute the best possible preparation for the

discharge of every social obligation of the citizen, including that of defending his nation, if need be, in time of war.

I hope that among the multitude of calls upon your time you may be able to give this important measure your consideration; and, if it meets with your approval after careful examination of its merits, I hope you will give the measure your hearty support. I feel sure myself that no more meritorious measure has been before Congress during the past two or three years.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. S. DEARMONT.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] may be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1 by inserting, at the end of line 7, on page 2, the following:

"Provided, That all sums accepted by and paid to any State shall, by the State board controlling its expenditure, be equitably distributed into all parts or sections of the State so far as it may be possible and practicable to do it under the provisions of this act."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] is adopted, it will change the plan and purpose of this bill. It is the purpose of the bill as framed by the committee not to interfere with the autonomy of the State, but to let the State work out its own salvation, so far as plans for the expenditure of this money are concerned, except, of course, that they must be approved by the Federal board. Now, if this amendment is adopted, it will put it up to the Federal board to be the judge as to whether or not the State board is to expend this money in one section of the State or in another section of the State or still in another section of the State. That is one difficulty with the gentleman's proposed amendment. Another is that it provides that this State board shall, in so far as practicable, see that the money appropriated by the Federal Government is expended equally or proportionately in the various sections of the State. The plans of the States for the expenditure of this money have not as yet been worked out. We can not tell what those plans will be. Whether they will try to connect up with the public-school system and teach these various vocational subjects through that channel, or whether they will try to form independent schools and classes for this purpose, we do not know. The community in the State that is willing to take advantage of this Federal money will have to put up dollar for dollar to match the Federal moneys. Now, if every division of the State should be willing to put up dollar for dollar in order to get the Federal money, I can see the force of the gentleman's proposed amendment. But suppose that a certain section of the State makes a demand for two or three of these schools and the other sections of the State fail to make any demand. In my judgment, it ought to be left to the discretion of the State board to expend this Federal money when the State matches it, in whatever section of the State there is a demand for these vocational schools.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I dare say that under the terms of this bill the State which I have the honor partly and humbly to represent will get as good a percentage of the appropriation as any. Personally I would have preferred that the States should not shirk their obligation to provide an education for their children. I am not in favor of these schemes for relieving States of all their obligations, nor can I indorse the theory which seems to be held by some gentlemen that what we get out of the Federal Treasury is clear gain. The same people pay these appropriations when they come by this more expensive and circuitous route who pay them when they are collected directly from the taxpayers of the State. But that was not the purpose of my taking the floor. I do not see why there should be any distrust, any lack of faith, in the mind of any gentleman as to the proper distribution of such funds as may be contributed by the Federal Government when turned over to the State educational agencies, and I was much impressed by the point raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who said that his State had 114 counties, and he intimated that if the allotment of butter under this bill is spread over the school necessities of 114 counties it will be so thin as to be of no value. Mr. Chairman, there are about 250 counties in the State of Texas, and that great enlargement of the area for the spreading of this butter makes it, to my way of thinking, still less effective.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman if he has read my amendment? If so he will see that it does not provide that the money shall be expended in all of the counties of any State.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It says "as far as practicable."

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. As far as practicable under the provisions of this bill, in all sections of the State.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not the idea of the gentleman's amendment to meet the clamor which you hear from all parts of the



State of Missouri, that they shall get their share? Now, if they are to get so small a share that it will be of no practical benefit, why waste the money?

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. The report says that there are \$1,500,000 in 10 years that will go to the State of Missouri. That is a considerable sum of money. Now, it ought to be fairly distributed and not be concentrated in a few or a dozen schools to the exclusion of all the others.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not think a million and a half dollars is a large sum for a great Commonwealth like Missouri, when distributed over 10 years. But even if it is considered a great sum, and it were not granted, I can not believe that the State of Missouri should or would fail to do her duty in the education of her children.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that it ought to be fairly and justly distributed over the whole State?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Frankly I think it ought to be kept in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. But if it is going to be paid to the State, does not the gentleman think it should be fairly and justly distributed?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If it is going to be paid out of the Federal Treasury it is fair to the State to give it to the State superintendent and the board that supports him and rely on their honesty and judgment for its effective distribution.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will.

Mr. FESS. The bill was written on the principle that the control of education would be left entirely with the State board. I fear that this amendment injects an initiation of an opportunity for the Federal board to take control instead of the State board. As I say, the bill was written on the idea that the State board should make the arrangement and that it should be approved by the Federal board. It seems to me that this amendment will change the whole order of the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think the gentleman's fear is well grounded, but the idea seems to be that the injection of Federal control is not objectionable provided it is accompanied by an appropriation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. From my standpoint I think there is no more important bill pending before Congress. It is very important to the agricultural States like Oklahoma. I want to say that I am in favor of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL]. If you read the report of the committee, it goes on to state that many children leave school in certain grades below certain ages, and that many are unable to complete the high-school course, and the report indicates that this bill and the appropriation made is really to help the poor boy and the poor girl. That is the class of children who need assistance.

I labored some time the other afternoon in asking a number of questions of those in charge of the bill, how it was contemplated that the appropriation should be distributed, but I am frank to say that I do not believe I got a satisfactory reply. Now, under the terms of this bill, out of the first appropriation for the first year my State of Oklahoma would get a minimum appropriation of \$5,000. The State and local community, or both, has to supplement that appropriation by adding another \$5,000. So that you have \$10,000 appropriated. Now, there are 76 counties in the State of Oklahoma. Will anyone volunteer to advise me how this \$10,000 can be expended in a State that has 76 counties so that it is going to help the poor boy and the poor girl out on the farm throughout the entire State?

The wealthy boy and the wealthy girl can, of course, pay their expenses in attending the State university, the normal schools, or the agricultural school or the district agricultural school, but how is this fund going to be expended through the State board of education so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl out on the farm that it is intended to benefit?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. The State of Oklahoma, when the maximum appropriation is reached, will get \$81,000 for agricultural purposes and \$22,500 for industrial purposes.

Mr. HASTINGS. But suppose the gentleman from Ohio was a member of the State board of education and there were 76 counties in the State, and you also had a State university, a State agricultural school, six district agricultural schools, six normal schools, and a number of other preparatory schools throughout the State, how would you distribute that fund so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl on the farm who is unable to pay board or go away from home to some city? How are you going to help the rural school?

Mr. FESS. The committee believed that a Federal appropriation of \$100,000 to Oklahoma, being supplemented by another \$100,000 by the State—and that is the minimum, because it might be \$400,000. That has been the rule as to the contribution by the State, where the Federal Government has contributed one dollar the State has contributed four. That is in accordance with our past history of appropriation, and it is supposed that that will be done later on by the State. It certainly would be unwise for us to undertake to say how it should be distributed in Oklahoma. It ought to be left to the State board of Oklahoma that is on the ground and who would not undertake to divide it up by a common multiple and give five or six dollars in one place, but leave it to the State board to put it in one place or a dozen places or 10 places or 100 places. In other words, it would not do at all for the Federal board located in Washington to undertake to say how this money should be distributed in Oklahoma. That must be left to the State board of Oklahoma and if you can not trust the board there, that is an argument against the bill entirely on principle, because we can not utilize the money. But I think we can if we leave it to the State board.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Ohio is a student not only of this bill but of educational matters in general. He is at the head of one of the principal colleges of the State of Ohio. I want to ask him this question: Suppose you were on the State board of education in Oklahoma, how would you suggest that the \$82,000 supplemented by an additional fund of \$82,000 could be expended in Oklahoma so as to reach the poor boy and the poor girl on the farm? That is the class that it is our purpose to reach.

Mr. FESS. It is the business of the State board to guard against the waste of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not want to vote for a "pig in a poke." I would like to be a little more practicable. Is it contemplated that this money should be used in the State universities?

Mr. FESS. It certainly is not, because it is limited to students or pupils under college grade, and that prevents the State universities from getting it.

Mr. HASTINGS. In what schools could it be expended, say, in the State of Ohio?

Mr. FESS. In the first place, there are three funds. One is to pay the salaries—

Mr. HASTINGS. We will take the agricultural funds.

Mr. FESS. When you talk about State universities, I would suggest to the gentleman that none of this money would go to the State universities, unless it receives a portion for training teachers.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will it be used in the high schools?

Mr. FESS. Yes; if they meet the age between 14 to 18.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, will any of it be used in rural schools?

Mr. FESS. Certainly; wherever the State board would apply it.

Mr. HASTINGS. But the State board could pick out any rural school in any county in the State of Ohio, or in any other State it saw fit.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. To the exclusion of all other rural schools?

Mr. FESS. We should not interfere with that from this point. We have to trust the State board upon this matter. We ourselves can not dictate that. The gentleman's fear that it will go to the State universities or to a special college or to some favored institution is not well founded, because it does not go to any institution teaching pupils of college grade. They must be below college grade, except the small proportion that goes for the training of teachers. That, of course, will go to the special training schools, whether it be the State university or the State normal schools or whatever your State board will decide upon.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then, these funds will be distributed through the State boards of education, and they may or may not go to the rural schools?

Mr. FESS. It would certainly have to go to the rural schools for the payment of salaries of teachers in agriculture, for there is where the agricultural teachers and pupils are. The gentleman's fears are unwarranted.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am heartily in favor of the principles of the bill. I wanted to make sure about the distribution of the money, so as to guard against the concentration of it in a few schools. I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, because I would like to see each county and each community receive some of the benefits from this appropriation. Thousands of boys and girls are not able to pay board and other expenses of attending schools away from home. The object of this bill is to bring these advantages as near to the people as possible.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am fearful that this bill when it goes into practical operation will prove a very distinct



disappointment. It is an effort to do that which has been tried heretofore concerning other matters, namely, to bring about a cooperation between the Federal Government and the various State governments touching a matter that should belong and does belong either to the one or to the other. If the entrance into vocational educational training is a proper Federal function then it ought to be done by the Federal Government without connecting it with or making it dependent upon State cooperation. If it is not a proper thing to be done by the Federal Government then the Congress should dismiss the subject and leave the matter to the States to work out. Somewhat on all fours with this proposition, Mr. Chairman, is the road bill that passed Congress last year. I believe that when that act goes into operation it will prove a very distinct disappointment to the people throughout the several States. Under the terms of this vocational educational bill, if I interpret the language correctly, States can not enjoy the benefits of it after a certain time unless those States make appropriations equal in amount to the Federal appropriations authorized in this measure. I do not believe that that is sound governmentally, and I feel quite sure that in its practical application a policy of that sort will create local jealousies, will create local contests that will eventually lead to the destruction of whatever good there is in this bill or else will lead away from that to the point where the Federal Government will take over the entire situation. I believe that the bill ought to be re-formed in its entirety, and, as I said a moment ago, if it is a proper function upon which the Federal Government should enter, then the Federal Government should do it independently of asking State cooperation or aid.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have a precedent for everything incorporated in this bill, for since the foundation of the Government Congress has passed more than 42 acts embodying these very principles.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have very great respect, indeed, for the opinion and good judgment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I am quite sure, however, that he will understand me when I say that I do not believe that he has given to this question the consideration that would warrant him in forming the conclusion that he states. This question is not a new question, let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee and to the committee. It has been discussed for more than 10 years in educational circles all over the United States. It has not only been discussed from its educational side, but it has been discussed as a constitutional question. The objections that the gentleman suggests have all been carefully considered. This bill is, of course, a novelty, as the good-roads bill was. The gentleman states that disappointment from the operation of this bill and the good-roads bill will occur. I, on the contrary, expect more of satisfactory returns than have ever been promised by the supporters of either bill. This bill is of stimulating quality, and it seeks to do that or to bring about the doing of that which everyone admits would be a great blessing to the country.

If the General Government can do this, as we have the constitutional right to do, if the General Government can bring to bear upon the educational interests of each State this stimulus and assistance that will lead them to extend their work in this direction, then certainly it will be of great benefit to the people of the United States. This fund is to be appropriated in only two ways, neither of which can possibly interfere with the operation of the States or their autonomy in the control of their methods of education. There are only two methods by which this fund is to be applied—first, to the training of teachers, and, second, to the payment of teachers. Everybody understands that this is specialized work. It requires the special training of teachers, and in order to encourage this special training a part of this fund is set apart for that particular purpose. Certainly no one could object to such a method of encouraging that form of education.

And the other method is for the payment of teachers. Gentlemen will understand that this specialized work must be to a great extent taught by expert teachers, especially in the inception of the work, and so the work is graded with a smaller appropriation at the first, to be increased yearly until a maximum is reached. For instance, a township in any of the counties where they may have a half dozen or more schools may not have any teachers that will be able to teach any of these economic subjects or agricultural subjects that we desire to have taught. They should have an expert teacher to go around to the country schools for a while in order to teach them the specialized subjects. There are many ways in which

this fund can be particularly applied so that, as suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS], it will not go to the benefit of any particular school or section, but will be applied, as he says, and as I agree with him, to the education of the children who will most need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he can state in how many States of the Union vocational education has already been inaugurated? It says in the report that it has been inaugurated in many localities. In how many different States have they inaugurated this system of vocational education?

Mr. TOWNER. I think in practically nine States. In some other States, however, they have commenced in a desultory way the teaching of vocational education.

Mr. WALSH. And can the gentleman state about how much money has been expended by these nine States and is being expended annually?

Mr. TOWNER. I can not answer that question. I will say to the gentleman, however, it is comparatively an inconsiderable amount. It is not nearly large enough to obtain the practical results we hope to obtain under this bill.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] seems to fear that the participation of the Federal Government in this matter will interfere with the working out by the States of their own educational problems.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I did not make that observation or anything from which, I think, that conclusion can be reasonably drawn. The gentleman, I am sure, misunderstood.

Mr. POWERS. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I did. At any rate, he was under the impression that this bill would work very unsatisfactorily and that it would be either abandoned by Congress or the Federal Government would have to take over the question altogether. I believe that is the substance of what the gentleman has stated. Is it not true that this bill is merely a proposition to the State to spend so much money under this section, provided we spend so much, and that any State in the Union can take advantage of it or reject it, just as it sees fit and proper?

Mr. TOWNER. That is true to a certain extent, but not wholly true. Certain conditions are prescribed that must be complied with.

Mr. GARRETT. What I wish to say is this: If any State wishes to take advantage of it, that State is paying its pro rata of the Federal taxes. If that State fails through its own entity to tax its citizens to raise a similar amount, it loses both, and, while it continues to pay its taxes which go to the Federal Government, it gets no benefit whatever.

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true, and I will say the same is true in regard to the appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi River or any other particular appropriation. Not many people of the United States will receive any direct benefit from any particular appropriation. Nine-tenths of all the appropriations we make here in Congress are not so made or so arranged that the entire people of the United States can participate in the benefit, but we hope to make our appropriations, and it certainly should always be the object to make legislation so general as to reach the largest number that we possibly can. In other words, to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there can be no possible method by which so many of the people of the United States could receive a direct benefit as to bring to them this method of better education and preparation for the active pursuits they must follow when they go out into the world to act for themselves.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Iowa understand that the sums appropriated under this legislation by the Federal Government could be used in the payment of a part of the salary of a teacher who, teaching the subjects provided for, also teaches other subjects?

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is no doubt about it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman thinks there is no question about that?

Mr. TOWNER. I think there is no doubt about it at all.



Mr. MONDELL. If that is not true, then the sums in a large agricultural State would be of little value in the ordinary common schools?

Mr. TOWNER. That is very true.

Mr. MONDELL. And the gentleman thinks there is no question about it?

Mr. TOWNER. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. MONDELL. What raised the question in my mind was that a moment ago the gentleman in his remarks referred to the fact that it might be necessary to have teachers especially trained that might go about teaching these various subjects in the school of a county or of a considerable agricultural community. The gentleman thinks, however, that that would not necessarily be required under the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. No.

Mr. MONDELL. But that in an ordinary district school the teacher qualified to teach agricultural subjects, we will say, or to teach industrial subjects, could have a part of his or her salary paid out of this appropriation?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has expired.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROUSE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On December 22, 1916:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916; and

H. R. 19178. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

On December 27, 1916:

H. J. Res. 282. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster of Springfield, Ill., with a special canceling die for the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Federal Union;

S. 7095. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved August 24, 1912; and

S. 6116. An act providing for the taxation of the lands of the Winnebago Indians and the Omaha Indians in the State of Nebraska.

On December 29, 1916:

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

On December 30, 1916:

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Jones.

#### VOCATIONAL-EDUCATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I think there has been and is now to a great degree a very unfortunate misapprehension as to the real purpose and object of this bill, at least as I understand its purpose and objects. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] raises the question that because Oklahoma will receive only \$100,000 aid through this bill it is such a small amount that it could be of no particular value in educating the poor boy and the poor girl in Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I said that \$5,000 the first year out of the fund would be of no particular value.

Mr. LENROOT. Well, whatever the sum is, the gentleman from Oklahoma and other gentlemen assume that the money that is to be expended in the education of the poor boy and poor girl will be the amount of Federal aid extended plus a like amount of State aid or contribution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope and believe that that will not be the case at all; that the Federal aid extended will only be a very small percentage of the amount that will be expended within the States for these purposes. Take the case of a rural community, we will say, in the State of Oklahoma.

If they are spending now in one county \$1,000 for agricultural education, and the State of Oklahoma shall receive \$100,000 from the Federal Government to be expended for that purpose, that county will receive aid in proportion only to the number of counties in Oklahoma that will adopt the necessary standards and qualify themselves under this bill to receive aid. It may be

5 per cent of the amount that that county raises for these purposes; it may be 10 per cent, or 20 per cent, as the case may be. But if it is only 5 per cent or 10 per cent, if it is an inducement to that county to raise its standard of agricultural education so as to conform to the standard required by this bill in order to get that aid, great good will have been accomplished in the education of that poor boy and poor girl in Oklahoma.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] fears that the passage of this bill will result in local contests. Mr. Chairman, if the passage of this bill does not result in local contests, the bill in my judgment will very largely fail in the accomplishment of its purpose. I hope and expect it will result in local contests. There will be contests between the localities as to which will be the first to adopt the standard approved by these Federal boards, so that they can avail themselves of the portion they are entitled to of Federal aid; so that instead of this being considered as a proposition of Federal aid plus an equal amount of aid by the State, it should be considered as only a sufficient amount of Federal aid to stimulate the States and localities to give the boys and girls of their States such education as shall be a practical vocational education.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that this section was thoroughly discussed by the commission appointed by the President for three months. It was also adopted by the Senate. It was under discussion by the Committee on Education of the House for about 10 months. All three have agreed upon this amendment. I regret not to be able to agree with my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], a man of magnificent ability and judgment. But, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that that amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there is nothing pending.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or some member thereof for information as to the meaning of the term "agricultural subjects." This bill provides, among other things, for the paying of teachers and the training of teachers to teach "agricultural subjects."

Now, then, does that include rural credit or cooperative business methods among farmers? That is what I desire to know.

Mr. HUGHES. The word "agricultural" means that which pertains to agriculture, to the soil.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I understand. That is what Webster says. Now, what is agriculture? My understanding is that the word "agriculture" refers entirely to the cultivation of the soil, the tillage of the soil, to the production of plants, and has nothing to do with the business end of farming.

Mr. HUGHES. If the gentleman will excuse me there, we have supervisors and directors out in the field to explain to the farmer and show him how to reduce theories to practice, so that he will study the scientific part of agriculture, and then it will be made operative in the field.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes. That is what I understand "agriculture" to mean, to go out and teach the farmer how to do better farming, scientific farming. I do not understand that that includes business affairs relating to farmers—relating to rural credits.

Mr. HUGHES. No.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman is hardly justified in his fears regarding that. The object of agriculture is not alone to produce, because if the farmer produces only he never gets anywhere. It is also the object of the farmer to dispose of his production as well as to produce it. I am quite sure the gentleman has in mind the question whether or not this would include assistants and help that would assist in the solution of questions that would teach the farmer how to dispose of his crop as well as how to produce it.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I have no hesitation in saying that the language would include that, in my judgment.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Well, let me ask the gentleman from Iowa, as well as the gentleman from Georgia, if they intended to include the teaching of the system or the principles of rural credits and better business in farming, such as cooperation in business, collective selling and collective buying, and so on?



Mr. TOWNER. I should certainly say collective selling would be within it. I do not know about collective buying. I am inclined to think that possibly might be outside the range. However, I would not venture an opinion on that question.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. What does the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] think of it?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. FESS. There were four fields discussed by the commission. One was the agricultural, one was the commercial, one was the nautical, and one was the industrial. The commission decided that commercial education was well cared for in high schools, and therefore need not be treated in this bill. The nautical, which would go to the merchant marine, was a matter that was specialized, and this bill would not take care of that. But the agricultural and the industrial were the two great fields that called for help.

Now, in attempting to designate what would be included in the agricultural, they considered that it would be so attenuated that they chose the term "agricultural subjects," in order to avoid the necessity of undertaking to name certain things, because if you undertake to name anything and do not name everything the things not named would be excluded. Therefore my own opinion is that while the principle of rural credits would not be likely to be discussed to children of 14 to 16 years, it certainly is not excluded from the purview of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Page 2, line 7, after the word "Provided," insert "That the words 'agricultural subjects' when used in this act shall include rural credits and cooperation in business among farmers."

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in the remarks which I have already made I think I have explained the purpose of this amendment so that most of the members of the committee understand it. If this act is passed simply providing for the paying and preparation of teachers and directors and supervisors in "agricultural subjects," in my judgment, it may be construed that none of this money can be used to teach rural credits or cooperative business methods among farmers. I believe that would be an unfortunate result. Now, in order that there may be no question about the intention of Congress to include rural credits and better business methods among farmers I have offered this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman mean that there shall be provided teachers to go out and teach the farmers how to cooperate? I understand that this is to teach the children who are studying in school.

Mr. FESS. Children of 14 to 16 years.

Mr. GARRETT. Between the ages of 14 and 16. Does the gentleman contemplate the hiring of men to go out and teach the farmers how to form farmers' unions and fruit growers' associations and things of that sort?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I mean simply this, that the boy who is old enough to understand scientific methods of farming is old enough to understand the principles of business and of cooperation in business. More than this, we need to educate teachers to teach rural credit and cooperation in business among farmers.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is perhaps abreast if not in the lead of any other nation in the world in providing instruction to farmers in the methods of farming. This is accomplished by our Agricultural Department, by our great agricultural colleges, by the work that is being done under the Smith-Lever bill, and through many other activities. We are spending many millions a year by these methods, but very largely this large expenditure is used to aid the farmer to produce more crops. Now, in the matter of business methods we are far in the rear of the most of the great nations of Europe. Our farmers are losing many millions of dollars every year because they have not been taught and trained to apply better business methods to farming. Some one has said that in agriculture we must have better farming, better business, and better living. So far as the farmers are concerned to-day the importance of having better business methods is greater than the necessity of having a better knowledge of the principles of scientific farming. We are behind in one matter; we are in the lead in the others;

and under this bill it is proposed to leave us still in the rear on that one subject. The one great question for the farmers of the United States to solve in the future, and the one thing above all others that the Congress of the United States should aid the farmer to solve properly, is how to enable the farmer to conduct his business on better principles.

During the last session of Congress we passed a bill making a beginning in the providing of farmers with better credit facilities, but that applied only to land credits and to the question of getting credit upon better terms upon farm mortgages. We have done nothing yet in the matter of providing better personal credit. Our farmers know nothing about cooperating together in order to enable them to have better credit on personal accounts, so that they may transact their business better. The fact is that there is nothing that will do so much to enlarge the products of the farm as will the providing of better credit facilities for farmers and better business methods among farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. We have already made a start, but only a start, in the matter of providing farmers with better credit. When you go to Germany, to France, to Italy, and to many of the smaller European States, you find that the farmers not only have special institutions to provide them with farm-mortgage credit but they have thousands of institutions which aid the farmers in having a better system of personal credit and a better business system. In Germany there are over 20,000 cooperative business societies among farmers.

We have had up the subject of providing a better system of marketing. Our farmers do not cooperate in business. All the rest of the business interests of the country are united. In the last half century we have gone from individuals and partnerships in business to the great corporations which dominate and control the business interests of this country. When the farmer sells his product it goes at once into the hands of great corporations, great concentrated business concerns, and these corporations control and finally distribute it among the consumers. We have a very complex system of sale and distribution, so much so that it takes one-half of the value of the farm product in order to get it from the farmer to the consumer. This is not only a great loss to the farmer, but it is a great loss to the consumers of the country. There is too much going to the middle man, and I do not wish specially in that way to throw out any reflection upon the middle men, who constitute the business interests of this country, but still, when confronted with the high cost of living, we must know that the one way to obviate that, the one way to make living cheaper, is to lessen the cost of bringing the products from the farm to the consumer.

So the farmers should cooperate in business, follow the lead of the business interests. Here you are going to pass a bill through Congress providing for the expenditure of millions of dollars, which will go on increasing from year to year, and not any of it may be used to teach the farmers to cooperate in business, and thus be able to help the farmer to produce more products of the farm and to compete with the great business interests of the country and secure his proper share of the wealth that he produces. The way to do that is to teach them to unite in their business efforts and cooperate in their business, and so far as they can sell direct to the customer and thus cut out the cost of distribution.

That is just what I propose in my amendment—that we shall make it plain beyond peradventure and doubt that we may use a part of this money to educate the farmers in better business methods.

Take my own State, her agricultural products amount to \$300,000,000 a year. Suppose by better business methods, by cooperation, by reducing the cost of transportation, the cost of manufacture, and the cost of distribution in the sale of farm products there would be 10 per cent saved; that would mean a saving of \$3,000,000 annually to the farmers of Oklahoma. But when you talk about going back to the farm, leading the people of the cities back to the farm and having our boys and girls stay on the farm, after all there is one thing that is necessary, and that is to make the farm more profitable. On that point hinges the future of our agricultural interests. Make the farm profitable and the boys will not leave it. The farmers must make money or they can not live in suitable dwellings, they can not have proper educational facilities, they can not have suitable vehicles for transportation, they can not have their houses prop-



erly furnished, and can not have facilities and opportunities for self-improvement and recreation. It is not what farmers produce that determines the money they make; it is a question of profits. What do the farmers make? is the question. And what farmers make depends largely upon the use of credit and in cooperation in business.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] should be adopted. The gentleman is always eloquent in behalf of the farmers of the country. No man who knows him or who appreciates his long service in this House would say that he has not been a true friend of the farmers of Oklahoma. He has been eloquent in his fight for the interests of the farmers. He wants the farmers to make more profit. He is anxious that the farmers should succeed in business. He is willing to destroy the middle man who carries the product of the farm to the city. He is willing to utterly forget the consumer of his product after it comes into the city. He is for the farmer first, last, and all the time, though it means, in the last analysis, that without his customer the farmer shall stay upon his farm, raise his own product for himself, and get it nowhere.

My idea of the purpose of this bill is that it is to generalize the education of the farmer, to assist at the same time the farmer's best friend, the consumer in the city, by education. If I have read this bill wrongly, it is my misfortune; but my belief is that if the bill is passed at all it ought to be passed not because it specializes in the interest of the farmer or prejudices the farmer's mainstay and best friend, the man in the city—

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that if the farmers could sell directly to the consumers in the city that that would furnish these products to the consumers in the city at a less price?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Undoubtedly it would.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman see—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Wait a moment. I want more time if I am to be interrupted at length.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I will ask that the gentleman have more time. Does not the gentleman see that my amendment is as much in line for the benefit of the consumers in the city as it is for the benefit of the farmers? In fact, the gentleman, I think, hardly construes my purpose correctly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman is to go on and state his position over again, I shall have to object. The gentleman asked the question whether or not it would not be a good thing for the farmer or the producer of the product to sell directly to the city man and consumer of the farm product, and I unhesitatingly answer yes. But the gentleman fails to take into account the middleman, whom he has decried, who is not only the man who markets the product but is also the man who constructed the railroad and obtained employment for thousands of men and made it possible for the farmer to obtain the tremendous prices he is now receiving for everything he produces from the toilers in the city. The gentleman from Oklahoma would abolish railroads when he abolishes the middleman; the gentleman would abolish the steamships; the gentleman would abolish the stores; the gentleman would abolish every union of farmers who are brought together for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of farm products when the gentleman destroys the middleman.

Why, a great department-store proprietor declared in public recently that he wanted the middleman destroyed. In that event what is to become of the shop girl? What is to become of the man who goes out to buy of the farmer? What becomes of the man who handles his goods?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the population of this country is not solely upon the farm. One-half the population at least is engaged in industrial enterprises, and if there is a hiatus between the man who is the consumer and the man who is the producer, it is the middle man who is at the service of both. The individual farmer sometimes has a complaint against some commission merchant who may have done him a wrong, and he grieves about it, and he gets it published in the newspapers, and his Congressman comes here and makes frequent speeches about it; but God help the farmer of this country the moment he goes so far as to destroy the means of trans-

portation, the means of communication, the means of distribution, every one of which gives employment to the middle man.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I understand it, then, the gentleman contends that the middle man renders a distinct service both to the farmer and the consumer?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, he does.

Mr. HASTINGS. If that be true, the more middle men the better.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How far is Oklahoma from New York City?

Mr. HASTINGS. About 2,000 miles.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman is a farmer and he is the farmers' friend. He is raising cotton or raising potatoes, I care not which. Let him put his cotton upon his back, or his potatoes and eggs and deliver them to me in New York City. I will pay a fair price for them. If the gentleman will have his farmer do that, he will help to bring about an intercommunication between the farm and the city. All the farmer has to do is to put his product on his back and deliver it. That will abolish the middle man, even if it brings stagnation in Oklahoma. If you are going to have communication, if you want to look at the question broadly, you have got to consider the means of transportation, the means of communication, and the means of distribution. Do not destroy the middle man right off the bat. Give the middle man a little chance for his white alley. Dear Mrs. Farmer in Iowa is not delivering her eggs to the consumers in Philadelphia at 60 cents a dozen—not much. She has not the opportunity to deliver them unless some one constructs a railroad, unless some poor thrifty fellow in my city puts enough money into the savings funds to be invested in the construction of a railroad to bring Iowa to the market, and that is all middle man.

I know people now who are denouncing the railroads, who want to have them regulated to death, and yet on picking up the reports of the savings funds in my city and in New York and in other great centers I find that it is the savings of the poor people, in whose behalf you are constantly pleading, that are maintaining, that are building, the railroads of the country and are bringing the East to the West and the West to the East.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Would it not be possible to deliver some of these things by water transportation? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and the sooner you all get that into your heads in the House of Representatives the better it will be for the welfare of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I think I want this bill passed, not because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] wants it specialized, but because I believe that the one great crying need of this country to-day is the practical education of the children of the land. [Applause.] There are too many seeking a higher education that fits them only to make other men work, and too few who are willing to be educated to do the work themselves. My father ran a farm of 200 acres in extent, and he failed at it. If he had been scientifically trained, he probably could have made a good living on 40 acres.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. That is the point. The gentleman's father would not have failed if he had been taught the business of farming. And that is the object of this measure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My father was not able to give me a college education, and the more I get along in life the more grateful I am to my father for having let me go to work at an early age. [Applause.] If I have been useful at all, it has been because I was not afraid to work. I think we are training lots of young men through the colleges to a magnificent champagne appetite when they are not capable of acquiring a beer income. [Laughter.] If this bill proposes to give a practical education through teachers trained for the purpose to the boys who work upon the farms, well and good. If it gives a practical education to the man or the boy who is willing to work with his hands in the city in any of the great industries, so much the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this amendment will not be adopted. The committee feels that it could not possibly go into all of the numerous details that would surround this bill under such an amendment as that, and therefore I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the section.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I will withhold that motion.

Mr. MANN. Make it in 10 minutes.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well, I will make that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 1, noes 21.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PLATT: Page 1, line 9, after the word "trade," strike out the words "home economics," and also on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "and home economics."

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in appreciation of the importance of home economics, but home economics is an endless subject, more or less taught and generally pretty well taught in every school in the country, in almost every school in the country, even the district schools, and its inclusion in this bill offers an opportunity to dissipate this whole fund in trifles. It does not belong in this bill at all. This is a vocational education bill, and home economics is not, strictly speaking, vocational education. I think we would greatly improve the bill if we took the question of home economics out of it. I think if the bill is subject to any legitimate criticism it is that it goes too far, anyway, and tries to take in too many subjects. It would be better if agricultural training were taken out of it and that subject left to another bill. We are dividing this fund up in such a way and making the bill so broad that the encouragement will be distributed around so that it may not do any good at all.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENBOO] has an amendment which we will offer subsequently, limiting the amount to 20 per cent. Will that be satisfactory?

Mr. PLATT. I should like to see it all go out. I should like to have a vote on that.

Mr. TOWNER. Would you like to submit it?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Have you excluded home economics for the training—

Mr. PLATT. On page 2, line 1, I take it out.

Mr. FESS. Was it the intention of the Member to exclude from it the teaching of teachers for home economics?

Mr. PLATT. Why, I think so. It seems to me it is dividing up the bill too much. The States are all teaching home economics now. They do not need any encouragement in this line. It is giving encouragement to something that does not need encouragement and taking away from the subjects that do need encouragement.

Mr. FESS. The very fact that we have so many schools teaching home economics would be an argument for training teachers for that subject, would it not?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly, but I know of no reason why the Federal Government should seek to encourage something which does not appear to need encouragement. An amendment to limit the amount would help some.

Mr. HUGHES. Will not the gentleman withdraw his amendment until we reach the point where an amendment will be in order along that line?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it the gentleman's understanding that home economics includes sewing?

Mr. PLATT. It includes everything under creation—sewing, cooking, and sweeping the floor, and so forth.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think we should strike out of the bill that part providing for industrial education of children?

Mr. PLATT. It does not need encouragement. It is already being taught everywhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Evidently it is not, because there are ladies who grow up to be magnificent dancers, and who know nothing about this subject. Why could we not teach them?

Mr. PLATT. You could not teach those ladies home duties no matter how much you might spend.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a vote on the amendment, Mr. HUGHES. Let us pass this now.

Mr. MANN. Oh, let us dispose of it now.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think with the limitation that is suggested the gentleman would hardly be justified in asking that this amendment which he offers should carry. To do so, Mr. Chairman, would be to exclude one of the subjects of industrial education that has always been connected with the subject of vocational education. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his views that this is outside of it. If you should adopt the gentleman's amendment you would teach the girls to become shop girls and factory workers and go into trades, and you would give them no instruction whatever regarding home making and motherhood. And that certainly is vastly more important than to become shop girls and milliners' assistants. The subject of home economics has been associated with industrial education from the very commencement of this great movement in the United States. It is certainly as important to teach the girls as it is the boys. The gentleman's view would limit practically the operation of this bill to the teaching of the boys of the United States and leave nothing whatever to the teaching of the girls. All over this country women of intelligence, with philanthropic minds, have become interested in this subject. They believe that the girls who are to become the home makers of the future, should be taught at least the fundamentals of these great subjects on which so much of the welfare and the happiness of the people depend. They are interested in helping to prepare the future mothers of American citizens how to make and keep an American home, how to insure sanitary surroundings, how to make the home attractive, how to care for the injured, how to treat the ordinary diseases and prevent infection and contagion.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Is not that very fact, that people all over the country are already interested in it, the reason why we should not include it in this bill?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, the gentleman's idea, that because they are already interested is a sufficient reason why we should do anything, is entirely erroneous. It is to satisfy this growing demand that we should act. Men and women are becoming interested in this subject because they see the need of action, and it is to do something that will accomplish the desired results that this bill is framed and presented.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. I doubt very much whether they teach domestic science in Port Jervis, in my colleague's district. I was born in that city. I think they ought to teach it there. We do teach it in New York City, and I think they ought to teach it in Orange and Dutchess Counties.

Mr. PLATT. They do teach it as well there as they do in New York City.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I really believe there is no one particular item contained in this bill that will bring so much good to the homes of this country and to the people of the generation that is to come as the assistance and stimulus it will give by teaching home economics. I think it will bring to us a better knowledge of the sanitation of the home, of the care of children, and in first aid for the injured in a dependency on good care and sensible treatment instead of a reliance upon patent medicines and quack nostrums. It will benefit the whole scheme of home-making and home-keeping if you elevate the home in the mind of a girl who thinks too much about becoming a shop girl, or a factory worker, rather than of going into the home and becoming a mother. In my estimation there is nothing that will so enlarge and ennoble the ideal of home-making and motherhood as to make them the subjects of research and scientific investigation. I hope that this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did it come to the attention of the committee that the boys were constantly leaving the farm and drifting into the cities, and was the prevention of that a part of the scheme entered upon in this bill?



Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the young women of the country are very much disposed to leave the farmhouse and respond to the allurements of the city also?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not therefore be judicious, so long as you are going to distribute money throughout the Union, that each State should induce its young women as well as its young men to stay on the farm?

Mr. TOWNER. I would say, "Yes, stay on the farm," rather than enter the factory or the shop. I would say to the girl, "Better stay in the home," until she becomes herself the mistress of a home than to go out into other fields of industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of \$500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$1,250,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$1,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of \$1,750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of \$2,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of \$2,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$3,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their rural population bears to the total rural population in the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of \$5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, nor less than \$10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter, and of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of \$48,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$34,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$24,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$18,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$14,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of \$11,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of \$9,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of \$34,000; and annually thereafter the sum of \$27,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I make this motion purely to take the opportunity to call the attention of the House to the fact that notwithstanding the statement made by Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, we had a quorum this morning to do business. If the newspaper reports that have been published are true, Mr. Lawson made the statement that if the truth concerning some stock manipulations on Wall Street were made public, it would empty the seats of Congress. There are a great many seats evidently that it did not empty.

I do not desire to usurp the functions of any committee that may have this subject under its control, but I feel that the accusations, if they really have been made by Mr. Lawson against the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, should be investigated, at least to clear our own skirts and to exonerate any Members of this House from any blame in connection with this transaction to which he refers, and make Mr. Lawson put up or shut up.

As I say, I do not wish to usurp the functions of any committee, but I have introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives asking for the appointment of a committee of three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members from the United States Senate to investigate the charges made by Mr. Lawson, giving that committee authority to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance, asking that committee to subpoena Mr. Lawson to find out what he knows about these accusations that he has made, and appropriating the sum of \$10,000 to cover whatever expenses may be needed.

Now, I do not know what you think about it, but the people of the country pay considerable amount of attention to accusations of this kind that are made against Members of Congress or persons who hold public offices, and I feel that here and now we should set an example in connection with accusations of this kind and, to use a slang expression, "put it up to Mr. Lawson's teeth." I have nothing to fear.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think he is taking these newspaper statements too seriously?

Mr. EMERSON. Well, the people are taking them seriously, and whether properly or not pay much attention to what Mr. Lawson says.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that the mails are filled every morning with the cranky notions of somebody from every State in the Union, and if Congress took time to investigate everything that was said about it, it would not adjourn on the 4th of March, or until the 1st of next January?

Mr. EMERSON. But Mr. Lawson and every man, woman, and child in this country knows that some attention is paid to what he says.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not much. Does not the gentleman know that Mr. Lawson has been scolding, scolding, scolding for some time?

Mr. EMERSON. That may be true, but it is up to us to do something to end these continued accusations and make Mr. Lawson either name the persons guilty or admit he is wrong.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman is not discussing the bill.

Mr. EMERSON. I admit that, but I am taking advantage of this opportunity to urge this House to take some action on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee with reference to the date in this bill as reported. It was reported to the House on February 12, 1916, nearly one year ago; and very properly the dates named in the bill at that time related to the fiscal year 1917. In view of the present situation and the condition of the Treasury I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think all of these dates ought to be moved forward one year?

Mr. HUGHES. I will state to the gentleman that I had intended to offer that amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman make that motion?

Mr. HUGHES. I will offer that amendment, that all the dates be moved ahead one year, that 1916-17 be made 1917-18, and 1925 be made 1926.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent that all the dates be corrected.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent that they be moved forward one year.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] asks unanimous consent that the bill be so amended as to move up one year the various dates set forth in section 2. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry. Was that request granted as to the dates all through the bill, or simply those in this section?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated it, it applied only to section 2.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it ought to apply to all the dates in the bill.

Mr. MANN. The dates run all through the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. I intended to include all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes a similar request as to the dates appearing in subsequent sections of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an observation that is very pertinent to this bill and all other bills of this character.

Of course, the Federal Government exercises its beneficent influence very largely through the expenditure of money. This bill calls for an appropriation, during a 10-year period, of \$38,400,000. At the present time there is considerable question in the minds of Members of Congress as to just exactly how the expenses of the Federal Government should be met. Yet there is an increasing demand upon the part of the people that the Government engage in various activities helpful to the people, similar to the one under consideration.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In a few minutes. These subjects include not only this great work, which means the development of the industrial and agricultural population of the country to a higher producing value and a higher social life, but rural sanitation and good roads and countless other activities of the Federal Government which are exercised in that way.



Now, my theory is, and always has been, that the important question is not how much money the people spend, although that question is often thrown at us, but the important question is as to the way in which that money is spent. If we spend the money of the people wisely and in a way which reflects a better industrial and social life of the people we are justified in spending it and in raising the taxes for that purpose, and I am perfectly willing to do it. But the fact that we are engaged in these enlarged activities and these constantly increasing demands is, in my judgment, another reason why we should not waste the people's money, why we should not throw any of it away, and why every dollar that we make the people pay for the activities of the Government should be expended for the efficient operations of the Government.

At the beginning of the last Congress and of this Congress I called attention to the fact that we waste between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 a year of the people's money by not requiring a standard day's work of eight hours of our employees in the District of Columbia. I have figured it up that this \$38,000,000 expended during a period of nine years is just a fraction over \$4,000,000 a year. In other words, for years we have been wasting in the District of Columbia enough money to carry on this kind of an activity all over the United States. I want to put that fact in the Record in connection with this bill, because I think that the people in the country who are interested in this subject and the people interested in rural sanitation, in good roads, and in other activities of the Government, are entitled to know whether there is or is not money available in the Federal Treasury to meet the demands of these activities. If we had an efficient operation of the departments in the city of Washington we would be in a position to spend this money to-day without a single dollar of additional drain upon the Public Treasury.

Now, that is not all. We are not only wasting four and a half million dollars of the people's money to-day in the present operation of the departments in the District of Columbia, but there is a propaganda going on for a Saturday half holiday all the year in the District of Columbia. They now get a Saturday half holiday 13 weeks in the year, and they want it for the other 39 weeks. That will mean 19½ more working-days taken off from their year, which is only 208 working-days long now. They work 208 days and they want 19½ days taken off that. That is practically a 10 per cent reduction in their working time. If these men give any service to the Federal Government at all in response to their employment that means that we would have to increase the force 10 per cent in order to do the same amount of work for the Government. That means an addition of \$5,000,000 to the \$50,000,000 pay roll now in the District of Columbia. In other words, that little demand, so innocent, so insidious, for a half holiday 39 more weeks in the year for this favored class of Government employees means the expenditure of \$5,000,000 of the people's money, or more than enough to carry on the activities involved in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask my friend from Ohio, Dr. Fess, what his understanding is and his interpretation of the words "rural population" in the bill?

Mr. FESS. The commission made the figures of 2,500; that is, all cities that would have a population of over 2,500 would be urban and cities with 2,500 and less would be rural.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not think it necessary to embrace in the law a definition of those terms.

Mr. FESS. It was thought that it was not necessary.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, the understanding of the gentleman is that "rural population" has a definite meaning?

Mr. FESS. Yes; under the law for the taking of the census, as we understood it.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no legal definition even under the census law, is there?

Mr. FESS. There is in my State; I do not know about the Federal law.

Mr. MANN. Does not this bill provide that it shall be according to the census?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The language is—

Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their rural population bears to the total rural population in the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census.

I suppose that would control it. Mr. Chairman, I want again to call attention to the language of the bill relative to the payment of salaries of teachers. I asked the gentleman from Iowa a short time ago whether he understood that a part of the

salary of a teacher could be paid out of this fund and he said he thought there was no question about that. That is very important, but it seems to me that the language of the bill is such that we might have a comptroller who would decide that none of these sums could be paid except for the salaries of teachers whose time is wholly occupied in teaching these particular branches. That could all be made very clear and definite by slight amendments to the bill. I shall not offer such amendments, but I suggest them to the committee; instead of using the words in section 2 "the salaries of teachers, supervisors," and so forth, the word "the" be stricken out and the word "for" inserted in lieu of the word "of," so that it would read "in paying salaries for teachers, supervisors," and so forth. And then in section 3 a like amendment, so that the language would be "in paying salaries for teachers of trade," and so forth.

I am perfectly willing to leave the language of the bill as it is if it is clear beyond question that these sums can be used in payment of part of the salary of a teacher in a district school, that part of the salary which was proper and in proportion to the time that the teacher used in teaching these subjects. Unless that is clear and definite beyond question, the funds appropriated would be of little value in an ordinary country school.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask whether this would cover the gentleman's objection. Here is a school that teaches commerce but does not teach industrial vocation. The question of the gentleman is, Could that teacher, teaching now commerce, that is not provided for in this bill, be paid to add to his teaching field the teaching of vocational trades?

Mr. MONDELL. I think I can better explain what I mean.

I can explain what I mean by referring to the case of an ordinary district school or a small graded school in which there might be one, two, three, or four teachers, but the size of which would not be such as to justify the employment of teachers to teach agriculture or home economics or trade or to teach any one or all of these subjects—a school where the instruction must necessarily be given by teachers a considerable portion of whose time is occupied in teaching other subjects and other branches. If the appropriation is going to be of real value except in the city schools, it must be clear that the appropriations could be used to pay a part of the salary of a teacher teaching a variety of subjects in addition to those specified in the bill.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I want to say that there is no question about the proposition that the teacher can be paid a part of his salary out of this fund and at the same time teach other subjects.

Mr. MONDELL. I have had that assurance from several members of the committee; but at the same time the fact remains that the language of the bill is such that an auditing officer inclined to be a little technical could, with a considerable show of reason, hold that none of this appropriation could be used except to pay the salary of teachers whose time was exclusively occupied in teaching subjects provided for and appropriated for in the bill.

It would be very regrettable if that should be the interpretation, because that would deprive the small communities of the benefits of the appropriation, and it would include practically all of the agricultural communities. I shall not offer an amendment. I am offering these observations simply for the consideration of gentlemen who have studied the bill and are familiar with the provisions, so that, if there be any question at all in regard to that, amendments may be offered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the general provisions of the bill. I was much impressed by what the gentleman from Tennessee said a moment ago, and the fear expressed by him that there would be great disappointment relative to the benefits that might be derived from the legislation. It is true beyond a question that if the character of instruction and preparation for instruction provided for in this legislation were to be paid for wholly and exclusively in this country by these appropriations, or by these appropriations supplemented by an equal appropriation by the State, if that was to be all and the end of it, then our people would be greatly disappointed.

As I have said, they would be greatly disappointed, because neither the sums proposed to be ultimately appropriated, nor twice those sums, nor several times those sums, would be sufficient for the instruction of the youth of this great country in industrial lines in home economics and in agriculture.

The principal virtue that the bill has, according to my point of view, is the virtue of stimulation. If the bill shall stimulate instruction in these lines, if it shall have the effect of challenging the attention of the country and the communities of the country through these appropriations and these aids



to the necessity and the importance of these lines of study, then we shall have accomplished a great good, and it is only because I hope and believe it will so stimulate instruction along these lines that I vote for the bill. I have but little confidence in it as a mere Federal contribution to aid the communities and provide for this instruction. I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], or what I assume to be his attitude, that in the main the communities must provide for the education of their own children. I have had some doubts as to the wisdom of the Federal Government engaging in this sort of thing at all. It can not in my opinion be justified from the viewpoint that it is an aid coming from on high, from the Federal Government to the people of different districts, which they must have or otherwise their people will not be educated. It can only be justified upon the ground suggested by several members of the committee, that it will stimulate and encourage industrial education, the sort of education which we so very greatly need in this country. That it will lead to increased activity, increased expenditures, for these purposes for the excess of the sum that must be contributed to match the Federal appropriation. If it does not have this effect, it will, indeed, be disappointing.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I suggest that the gentleman defer his motion a little bit.

Mr. MANN. I think we better make some agreement as to time.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments pending thereto conclude in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in the matter of educating boys along industrial lines, and my judgment is that this bill will not under its provisions accomplish the object sought. The distribution of the fund proposed to be appropriated in the bill, if apportioned throughout the States as the bill indicates, will result in nothing more than the expenditure of the money, in my judgment. If you want to accomplish industrial education or vocational education, whatever you may please to term it, you will have to establish educational plants along the lines that you propose to teach, where you will have a complete plant, where the boys and the girls may be educated from the ground up in the art of mechanics or whatever the line may be. You can not select a teacher here and there who can occasionally say to those under his jurisdiction, "You ought to train your minds along certain lines"; but, Mr. Chairman, you must teach the hand to work with the mind if you expect the coming generations to be proficient in the different callings in which they may be required to exercise their abilities and energies. I recall very well several years ago that boys learning different lines in the building trades learned only to use the tools of the trade. They were experts in the use of the tools, but they knew nothing whatever about what the material they were shaping with the tools was intended to be used for after they were through with it. So a few of us who were engaged in the building trades organized a trade school, and we maintained the trade school at our own expense in our State.

We compelled every apprentice boy indentured to a trade in the building line to attend this trade school for three months every year, and there we taught those boys mechanical drafting, we taught them all of the complicated questions connected with the building art. They were learning how to use the tools at their work, but they knew nothing whatever about the place the material they were making had in the building which was to be erected. They knew nothing whatever about how to measure tensile strength, they knew nothing about carrying loads or the weight of material and the character of construction

that was required to make the building safe. We taught them that, and we compelled every man who employed an apprentice to send his apprentice boys to the school and to pay their full compensation during the period of their attendance at the school. Later on the State of Illinois took over this school, and the State of Illinois is to-day conducting this school. We are educating men in the building arts at the expense of the State of Illinois, and we are educating men and women in the art of agriculture at the expense of the State of Illinois. We are going to continue to do that. If the Government of the United States, through any appropriations that may be made by Congress, expects to accomplish any results, you are bound to consider the question of a complete plant in which every branch of the trade sought to be taught to the children who attend the schools can be displayed to their minds. You must teach them how to handle tools; you must teach them how to use their brains; you must teach them how the things they make are to be applied, and that is something you can not do in the ordinary school.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman's talk is very interesting. Did these boys who are taught the primary work in the building industry learn that in private establishments?

Mr. MADDEN. They learn the primary work in the private establishments, but they are compelled to attend school while learning it, and the man who employs them as apprentices is compelled to pay them their salaries while they are at the school.

Mr. COX. They get their practical work in the private establishments?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COX. And while doing that work they are compelled to go to school?

Mr. MADDEN. They are required to go to school for three months in every year.

Mr. COX. How old were these pupils?

Mr. MADDEN. They can not begin to learn the trade until they are about 14 or 15 years of age, and they are required to serve four years before they can be graduated.

Mr. COX. And they must continue in that school for three months during all of the four years?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. Some years ago in our State we determined to teach agriculture, and we were up to the question of whether we should establish separate schools such as the gentleman speaks of or whether we should conduct the work in conjunction with existing high schools. After canvassing the situation pretty thoroughly we decided upon the latter course and have established some 30 or 40 agricultural schools in Michigan in connection with high schools. And, if the gentleman's time is not too limited, I would like to tell him how that worked.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be very glad to hear it.

Mr. KELLEY. The State pays half the expense in conducting those schools in connection with high schools and the district pays the other half. The teacher is supplied from the agricultural college. Now, in the spring the classes in agriculture are taken out into the surrounding country and they study orchards; they study the crops during the various seasons, also animal industry, soil, and everything that pertains to farming. And the system has worked out most satisfactorily. And at the same expense we are educating in Michigan probably thirty or forty times as many young men as farmers as in Wisconsin, where they have adopted the other plan, that of having separate institutions.

Mr. MADDEN. They likely could do that with agriculture, because the farms are adjacent to the country schools, but you can not do it if you are going to educate a man as a machinist or a stonemason or carpenter, or for any other trade, because you have not the plants.

Mr. KELLEY. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. Not very far from your city of Chicago is the city of Gary, where they connect the public schools with the industries of the city, and as a part of the regular course of instruction in the high schools boys work a certain number of hours in the factories of the city. Why could not that plan be adopted everywhere?

Mr. MADDEN. They can work at a certain trade where they have a factory, but the thing is to realize before you take this money out of the Public Treasury that you are not going to accomplish the object for which you are making the appropriation unless you adopt some different method than the one proposed in the bill.



Now, I am for the bill, but I am largely for it as a matter of sentiment, and not because my judgment dictates that the plan is wise. The gentleman is an educator, a prominent one, distinguished in his State and in the Nation, and recognized as one of the leading educators of the country; but quite as distinguished men as he have appealed to me to vote for this bill and advocate its adoption, men from my own State, and when I asked them the reason why they were for the bill they said that it would bring \$2,700,000 to the State of Illinois. I said, "If you want to get my vote for the bill and my assistance to enact it into law, you have got to appeal to my brain and not to my avarice, for, after all, Illinois is able to educate its own children, and for every dollar that Illinois gets out of the Treasury under this bill she will pay \$20 in. We are paying the bills to maintain the Government of the United States, and there is not any inducement whatever to the State of Illinois and States like that to pay \$20 in order to get \$1 out; and we are able to do the work ourselves." However, if the bill will in the least particular advance the cause of education, or make for greater efficiency among our future citizens, or the better qualify them to successfully compete in the struggle for supremacy, or add to the prestige of the country, or prepare it to meet the competition of other nations in the race of life, I am in favor of its enactment into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I doubted at one time whether I would be able to attend the session of the House to-day on account of my health, but I have always entertained a desire to do something to pass the pending bill. We have had it up frequently in the House and in the Senate, but owing to a disagreement on the part of the two Houses were compelled to delay final action by sending it to a commission. It is not what I would like to have. It is not all we need, but it is a beginning; it is an entering wedge on what I consider one of the greatest pieces of meritorious legislation ever submitted to the American Congress. It only carries an appropriation of thirty-odd millions of dollars over a term of years. It really ought to be at least \$30,000,000 for the first year instead of \$500,000.

The people of this country are going to demand of Congress and those who are elected to serve them that they shall go into the question of national aid in the construction of public roads thoroughly, and hand in hand with that they are going to demand that of the immense amount of money collected from the taxpayers and disbursed through appropriation bills that every boy and girl of this country shall have an opportunity to be educated not in a 5 or 6 months' school but in a 9 or 10 months' school, by competent teachers justly and adequately paid.

I have always regretted as a southern man that certain leaders of the South in Congress, when that great Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Blair, proposed national aid for education, did not pass his bill. They objected to it on the line of being a violation of the Constitution and in conflict with the rights of the States. Had that measure become a law thirty-odd years ago the South, where the great bulk of the illiteracy of the country existed, would have been educationally cleared up.

Now, Europe will be prepared at the end of the present war along vocational lines. I received a few days ago in the mail an illustrated book mailed in London, England, showing the pictures of the women, girls, and boys who have been trained industrially in the various manufacturing plants of England. If we are going to seriously enter upon the question of preparedness in this country, let us begin by educating our children [applause] not only in the public schools, but let us go far to equip them with a vocational or practical education in the right way. It would be the greatest blessing and good we could confer upon the American people, and would be of great and lasting benefit to the Republic. We would get more for the dollars we would spend in that way than if invested in any other way.

Now, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], in charge of this bill. This measure, I am sure, is not all he would like to have it. He has had to contend with the Senate committee, and we have all been here long enough to know that in proposed legislation, where there is conflict of opinion, we must concede and compromise; but I want to commend him for his hard, efficient, and zealous work, and at the same time I want to say that the State of Georgia never committed a greater mistake than in not returning him to Congress. Had his reelection been submitted to a vote of this House, in my opinion there would not have been a dissenting voice. He would have been the choice of every Democratic and every Republican Member. [Applause.]

While I have served in this House eight years, I would rather go out of it with my name as the author of a vocational education bill than anything else to my credit.

I commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] for the splendid work he has done not only for his district and State and the South but for the entire country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want anything that I may say regarding this bill to be construed as opposition on my part, for I shall be pleased to vote for the measure when the time comes. I am frank to say, however, that I shall vote for it with many misgivings. I have grave doubts as to the accomplishments of its practical operation and as to whether much that is promised will be performed.

I was greatly impressed with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to the effect that the duty of education belongs either to the General Government or to the State government; that it did not nor could not belong to both. I have frequently wondered during my service in this body as to where the demands for Federal aid will ultimately lead us. In the last year I have witnessed the appropriation of money for the relief of the flood sufferers in the Mississippi Valley, for combating the citrus-fruit canker, for the construction and maintenance of good roads, and now, at last, for education. The purpose in each instance was primarily a State duty, a State obligation. I have sometimes wondered, if the States are determined to shirk their obligations and their duties and are determined to depend upon the National Government for their performance, if in the evolution of the hurrying years the General Government will not say to the States, "If we must bear the burden of your obligations; if we must perform your duties; if you are determined that the General Government is to assume all of these, then to the extent of such assumption we will take of your sovereignty."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. REAVIS. In just a moment. I find many Members talking loudly of State rights who are silent on State duties. These Members are breaking down State sovereignty. In all of these Federal-aid propositions the General Government is slowly, insidiously encroaching on the powers of the State. In the good-roads bill we have the provision relating to the Federal Government's supervision and maintenance of the road after construction.

The evil of that is not in the supervision of the road. The evil of it is the encroachment of the General Government upon the sovereignty of the States. In this bill we find in some measure a Federal board supervising the educational facilities within the States. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The Federal board initiates nothing in this bill, but simply approves of plans to be initiated by the various States; and, second, no State can get a dollar from the Federal Government without matching it with the dollar that the State furnishes. That is cooperation, and not gratuity.

Mr. REAVIS. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the object of this bill is for the General Government to offer a financial consideration to the States for performing a manifest duty. In only nine States, as we are informed, has vocational education been inaugurated. We are now offering not only to those States, but to the rest of the States of this Union as well, a financial consideration as an inducement to them to educate their children. We are by this bill saying to them, in effect, "If you will perform your duty you shall have this money, otherwise you shall not." It is true that the plan is to be formulated by the State boards, but the plan as formulated by the State boards can not be acted upon without the approval of the Federal board, so that in the last analysis you will have the General Government taking over the sovereignty of the States with respect to the education of the children within the States. I think I can see as a part of the philosophy of this movement for Federal aid—it may not come in your time or mine, but it will come sometime if the present tendency be continued—when the State will retain only that portion of its sovereignty which it demonstrates it can perform better than the National Government, and in the survival of the fittest, the National Government, if this process keeps on, will eventually take over those duties and obligations and sovereignties of the States which it can perform better than the States themselves.

I think it but wise that we consider which way we travel, that we may in some measure learn of our probable destination.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, am I encroaching upon the time that has been allotted?

Mr. CANNON. Go ahead.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois has some time.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is entitled to five minutes.



Mr. CANNON. I understand that 10 minutes remain.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. There remain 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent for five minutes, not to interfere with the time allotted?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, while we are philosophizing touching these matters, I should like to indulge in just a few moments more of discussion. I have been very much impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and the way in which he points out the danger of the encroachment of Federal power. If I may be permitted to make this observation, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all the encroachments of Federal power since the War of Secession have been made through the use of the taxing power of the Federal Government, and the reason for it is this: The citizen has not known when he paid his Federal taxes. The system of taxation has been indirect, rather than direct. The State taxation has been direct. The citizen has known when he paid his State taxes, because he went to the collector's office and he took the cash from his pocket, he paid it over, and he obtained only a tax receipt in return. He has not known when he paid his Federal taxes, because of the indirect system of taxation. The hand of the tax gatherer was hidden. The natural result has been—a perfectly natural result—that the State legislative bodies have hesitated to appropriate moneys for those things for which they probably should have appropriated money, and so there has come a demand upon the Congresses to make appropriations for things for which the States themselves should have appropriated. I believe gentlemen who have studied the history of taxation in this country and the development of the institutions of this country within the last 40 years will agree that that statement is correct.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I will; certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. How will my friend from Tennessee reconcile the fact that up until the last four or five years the States were increasing their taxation very much more, proportionately, than the National Government was?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not agree with the fact stated by the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I can not give the gentleman the exact figures, but I think the gentleman will find that within the last quarter of a century, up until the time these extraordinary expenditures for preparedness, and so forth, were imposed upon the Federal Government, the increase of State taxes was very much more, proportionately, than the increase of national taxation. I will say that in very many of the States of the Union now it is five or six times per capita greater than the amount of the national taxes.

Mr. GARRETT. To that State, or taking the country as a whole?

Mr. TOWNER. To that State. Not all the States have made a like increase, of course.

Mr. GARRETT. I shall not quarrel with the figures presented by the gentleman. He is doubtless more familiar with them than I am; but I do undertake to say that during the 12 years I have been in the House of Representatives there has been this constant pressure upon Congress continuously to take care of things that ought to have been taken care of in the States themselves. I think that will increase. I do not anticipate that we shall learn economy here until the Federal Government goes to a basic system of direct taxation. When it does reach that point, then there will be economy in the Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to trespass upon the time of the House, but may I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for 5 minutes more, not to be taken from the 30 minutes agreed upon for debate upon this section. Is there objection?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to this request, but I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the gentleman's five minutes I shall have to object to any further extensions.

Mr. GARRETT. The time for debate upon this section having been limited by motion, I withdraw my request.

Mr. CANNON. I think I am entitled to the other five minutes, and I will yield the remaining time, if I may, to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT. No; I will not take the time of the gentleman from Illinois. I withdraw my request.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I agree with some of the things that they have said. Not having given much attention to this bill, I am trying to find out whether I am going to vote for it or not. As I have heard it discussed and have glanced over the report and over the bill I have wondered whether, if it be enacted, it will result in much good to the people whom we are trying to benefit, and that means all our people, the present and the coming generations. In many of our State governments we have too much machinery. We have too much machinery in Illinois. Think of it! As nearly as we can find out, 100 commissions, with separate jurisdictions, with secretaries and employees, and all kinds of expenditures. Our expenditures in Illinois are climbing and climbing. I hope and believe there will be a reform there in the way of lessening expenditures and giving better service. It is wonderful how we are progressing in the Federal Government, too, in the matter of personnel. I quite agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] and I sympathize with the fear expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. But what does this bill propose? It proposes co-operation with the States in the expenditure of a comparatively small amount of money, with the approval of the Federal Government. If this bill passes I apprehend that very little of the money that is provided to be appropriated from year to year will ever get to the 14 or 16 year old boys and girls. I apprehend that the Bureau of Education here will grow marvelously. I am not now speaking of any individual, but it is wonderful how machinery increases and what a grist it will grind when there is something paid for it. I say again, I doubt whether I shall vote for the bill. Oh, if you want me to express a desire that all people shall be educated practically, I have that desire; but there seems to be a great deal of sympathy for the farmer.

The farmer in Illinois does not need any sympathy. He has made his way. We have gone through much of effort and sometimes of suffering, but the farmer in Illinois—and I think generally, so far as I know in all the States, certainly in the Northern States—is better off than the other two-thirds of the population. The farmers constitute one-third. If you could put all of the other two-thirds of the people into a mixing machine and grind them all up together, including the magnates, the plutocrats, the college professors, the Socialists and the uplifters, the millionaires, and the business men of all kinds and thoroughly mix them so you could not distinguish one from another, you would find that the one-third of our population, the farmers, could give to either of the other two-thirds cards and spades from every standpoint, both in wealth and intelligence, and then win. So I resent somewhat this desire to be charitable to the farmer. He is able to take care of himself. That which costs nothing is not appreciated. We are getting much by direct taxation, when we could have gotten it just as well, without increasing the cost of living, by indirect taxation, the same as we have done in former years. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I do not intend to start an economic discussion or a discussion as to the proper method by which the money is to be raised at this time. I notice that we are getting great amounts of money from the income tax and the inheritance tax and other direct taxation, but we are keeping that taxation away from the multitude. When we took off the stamp tax in the last session of this Congress our honorable friend the majority leader [Mr. KIRCHIN] said the stamp tax was not popular. I asked him why he did not refund it, and he said it would take too much bookkeeping to refund that which had already been paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$1,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$1,250,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of \$1,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of \$1,750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of \$2,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, the sum of \$2,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, the sum of \$3,000,000; and annually thereafter the sum of \$3,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their urban population bears to the total urban population in the United



States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of \$5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, nor less than \$10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter, and of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$66,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$34,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$28,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the sum of \$25,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the sum of \$22,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, the sum of \$19,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, the sum of \$56,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and annually thereafter the sum of \$50,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio a question which was suggested by the inquiry of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] some time ago as to whether this money could clearly be used for the payment of teachers who were engaged in teaching, for instance, home economics and other subjects. I call his attention to the language in section 9, which is:

That the appropriation for the salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects and of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects shall be devoted exclusively to the payment of salaries of such teachers, supervisors, or directors having the minimum qualifications set up for the State by the State board, with the approval of the Federal board for vocational education.

Is not there really danger that a teacher who only gives a part of her time to these subjects would not come in under this provision, and would it not be made certain that she would by adopting the slight change of language which was suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FESS. My own opinion is that section 9 does not exclude the right of a teacher who is teaching commerce, for example, to add to his teaching some such thing as provided for in this bill.

Mr. BENNET. I do not state dogmatically that it does. Of course, it does not affect the city that I have the honor in part to represent, because where we have a manual science teacher or any one of those teachers, he devotes his whole time and is supposed to be specialized, and in most cases he is. But it did seem to me that the bill ought not to keep the promise to the ear and break it to the hope of the rural community, but, of course, the gentleman is far more directly interested in that than I am.

Mr. FESS. Section 9 was written by the commission before the committee got hold of it, and it was to prevent the money from being expended for a purpose foreign to that of the bill, and that very point suggested by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Wyoming was discussed, and it was thought that there was no embarrassment or confusion of any kind. If one school wanted to add a subject provided for in this bill that was not already in its course, if the State board would permit it, it would get the amount required. But that must be exclusively used for that teaching—the part they get from the Federal Government must be used for the exclusive purpose of teaching the additional subject.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman may be right, but as I get older and more gray headed I realize the benefit of the maxim "safety first"; and, in view of the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming that the slight change of language would remove all doubt, it seems to me and I suggest to the gentleman whether it would not be worth while to return to the section and amend it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As to section 9, the only limitation is that the payment of the money must be to teachers who have the minimum qualifications set up by the State board.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; I read that.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman read, and I do not see how he makes any application further.

Mr. BENNET. It seemed to me that the language, taken in connection with section 3, some State controller might raise a doubt. I am not offering an amendment. I am not dogmatic about it.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether they may get a crazy State controller somewhere, but I do not think any gentleman who reads this language would so construe it, and there is no better interpreter of the English language than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the question raised by the gentleman from New York, and I am going to tell one or two things that I saw during the vacation which,

I think, have some pertinence and application here, and I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] how under such circumstances these features would be affected by the proposed legislation?

During the vacation, not being very much engaged in active politics—my Republican opponent having been put to sleep early [laughter]—I was invited to visit some of the schools in my home town of San Antonio. First I visited a negro school, one of the most efficient and best conducted schools that I ever saw in my life, an immensely better school than I ever had the privilege of attending in my youth, which was during that period in the history of the South when we had comparatively few and usually inefficient schools. This particular school was a public school of the city of San Antonio. One of the most important features of its work, perhaps the most important, was the teaching of what is called domestic science—cooking, and so forth, and I was served with a wonderfully fine luncheon cooked by the pupils—including dressmaking and things of that kind, and carpentering and blacksmithing. My information was that these things were taught by teachers who also taught other things.

In another school, the great central high school, I saw immense shops for carpenters and smiths, and they were making all the school furniture. They were doing all kinds of work like that, and doing it admirably; and so efficiently and rapidly did they do it that the superintendent of schools of the city told me that he had some doubt of the wisdom of the policy, because, he said, the boys became efficient so soon, and so very efficient, that their services were sought for in the industries of San Antonio, and that they were tempted to abandon their ordinary scholastic pursuits by the high wages offered.

Now, I would like to know of the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, whether unless this fund, if it shall be appropriated, is turned over to the State educational authorities to be distributed in their judgment, the teachers engaged in teaching grammar, reading, writing, and things of that kind, who also are capable of teaching and engaging in the work of teaching other things provided for in this bill, will be cut off from any benefit from this fund? Will there be any doubt about the right to pay part of their salaries from this fund?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that, in my judgment, there will be no doubt. The bill provides that in order for a State to receive the money the State must provide for the plant.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We have already provided these particular plants the gentleman apparently has in mind.

Mr. FESS. And the State board or other authority must provide for a minimum qualification of teachers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois upon that point, which were somewhat reassuring.

Mr. FESS. And third, they must provide also for expenditure that is to be fixed as a minimum, and all of this is to be submitted to the Federal board, and if the Federal board approves of it the money can go for that particular purpose. I see no reason at all why the case the gentleman speaks of is not covered by the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that vocational training is being very generally adopted and rapidly made a more important part of the school curriculum everywhere?

Mr. FESS. I have just looked through the vocational commission report. There are nine States that by law provide for vocational training, but there are cities upon cities that have done it without reference to the State authorities, so that if the gentleman would ask me how many cities or localities have taken it on, I could answer that they are very numerous, though there are only nine States that have done it by law.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I know from personal observation that the country schools are doing it in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, at the end of section 3, adding the following:

"That not more than 20 per cent of the money authorized to be appropriated under this act for the payment of salaries of teachers of trades, home economics, and industrial subjects for any year shall be expended for the salaries of teachers of home-economics subjects."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment be adopted, and I understand that it is acceptable to the members of the committee, not more than 20 per cent of the aid provided for in this section can be expended in the payment of salaries of teachers of home-economics subjects.



As the language in the bill now reads, without this limitation I am satisfied that a great many States would be able to receive all of the money provided for in this section without any new activities whatever upon the part of those States, and the whole purpose of the bill is to stimulate the States into doing those things which are not being done now, or, if done, not properly done, in order that they may provide a practical system of vocational education. This amendment will at least insure that 80 per cent of this fund will be used for subjects other than home economics subjects. I am a good deal in sympathy with the view of the gentleman from New York, Mr. PLATT, that home economics ought not to have been in the bill at all, so far as providing for the payment of the salaries of teachers is concerned.

Mr. FESS. It was not in the original bill.

Mr. LENROOT. It was not in the original bill, and it is not in the Senate bill for which this is a substitute. I say this not because I feel less interested in the subject of home economics than any other Member, but in my judgment the subject of home economics should be a part of the general educational system of the country. It ought to be a part of the curriculum of every school. Every girl, irrespective of what vocation she may ultimately follow, ought to be taught home economics, and the whole idea and object of this bill is to provide a vocational education. But it is in the bill, and I realize very well that many Members may not appreciate as I do or feel as I do concerning the incorporation of home economics in this bill. As I said a moment ago, this limitation of 20 per cent will at least insure 80 per cent of the fund to be used for new activities upon the part of the States, rather than merely an aid to the States in bearing the burdens they now bear and that they ought to bear.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a Congress met here at the beginning of the Civil War, a Congress that was confronted with some very difficult problems, which have probably not been equaled since then, and yet that Congress passed a law providing for the creation of agricultural and industrial colleges and making an appropriation amounting to \$15,000 a year for each of the States for agricultural experiment stations. We carry now in the Agricultural appropriation bill every year, without opposition, an appropriation of more than \$3,000,000 under the heading of States Relations Service, about half of which goes to the agricultural experiment stations to aid in education. I make profert of myself as evidence—not too proud of it—of what the agricultural colleges, the land-grant colleges, could do years ago. In the early days of those colleges I became a student at what is now called the University of Illinois, and went there partly because my father was interested in such subjects, and partly, I imagine, because there was little if any tuition fee. I believe they have done a great good. The appropriation in the course of these many years has been somewhat increased, and yet it is not exorbitant to-day. While the General Government makes some appropriation for this class of education, it has not assumed the entire burden. The great increase in the cost of the agricultural colleges, the land-grant colleges, has come from the people of the States through the State treasuries and not out of the General Treasury. We have reached that point where most of the States now prohibit children from doing anything but loafing or going to school. They are not permitted as we were, when we were young—not only permitted, but required—to work, and we can not go on without providing that the children shall have the opportunity of learning how to do things. It is not difficult in this country to learn how to think, but it is difficult to learn how to do. I sometimes think that if we had fewer thinkers and more doers we would be just as well off; but when we can add thinking and doing together, that is where we reach the summit of education. [Applause.] That is the theory of vocational education, and as the General Government in the sixties started with its land-grant college provisions the vocational idea of giving the farmer a training, so now through this bill it proposes to encourage the idea of giving the boy and the girl the right to learn how to do things while thinking as well.

I welcome the day when we shall engage upon this wonderful undertaking. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of this bill is in keeping with the progressive spirit of the age. Vocational training began on an extensive scale in this country in the schools some 20 years ago. It was difficult at that time to find a teacher who could teach vocational training. We have a State normal school in Kansas, located in Pittsburg, my home town, that trains over 1,000 teachers. There are over 1,000 students there now from Texas, from Vermont, from Maine, from California, from every State, almost, in the Union, taking

vocational training, and they are trained to teach in the schools of the country—how to think and how to do at the same time. One school teaches girls not only how to find out how much three pounds of coffee will come to at 28 cents a pound, but teaches them how to make the coffee, which is just as important as to know how much it costs. It also teaches them how to take care of a sick baby and how to clean up a sick room. It teaches girls how to repair a chair, a sewing machine, or any piece of furniture in the house. It teaches the young men how to do things that will be necessary for them to do on the farm, as merchants, or mechanics. It teaches young men how to use their hands and their brains, so that they can become experts in the industries of the country. And, as stated here a moment ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], the difficulty is in keeping young men in the school long enough. They become so expert that the industries want them and want them at once, and they are taken out of the school before they have finished the course and before they have fully equipped themselves to become instructors. They get an offer of better wages than school-teachers are ordinarily given to go into some of the industries of the country because of the learning they have acquired in this vocational school. As teachers they get better salaries than other teachers. So, whatever this bill may be able to do to advance vocational training throughout the country will be for the great betterment of the people of the country in every vocation in life—farming, manufacturing, housekeeping, and every phase of life and every activity that administrators to the comforts and happiness and prosperity of the people.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Excuse me. I thought the gentleman had finished.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I have any more time, I will yield it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—

Mr. HUGHES. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for just a moment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, we are exceedingly anxious that this bill should be absolutely perfected, and it is of vital importance that we should do it this afternoon. I move now—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman to make his motion in the midst of my five minutes. I know the gentleman does not want to impose a cloture rule on the House?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is one of the most courteous gentlemen in the House and would not close anyone out from a fair time for debate. I understand that is the gentleman's position. No one has opposed the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I desire to discuss it, because if it is adopted it would appear, providing we were to deal only with the education of girls, that 20 per cent of the pupils would be taught home economics, which means the development and the preservation of the home, and 80 per cent would be left free to be given instruction as to how to work in the mills. Carried out literally, that is what it would mean.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the gentleman know that vocational education in commerce is as much for the benefit of the girls as for the boys, and is not the operation of mills to-day quite as much for commerce as manufacturing?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be; but I doubt if the gentleman wants to limit the education of girls to several branches of industry to the prejudice of their education in properly conducting a home. I have some feeling on this subject, because I come from a mill district. If I had my way, I would not permit a girl to work in a mill. [Applause.] If 80 per cent of the girls who are to be taught under this paragraph are to be taught industrial trades, I am certainly against the proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin that only 20 per cent of them shall be taught the useful life and occupation of conducting a home.

Now, why this amendment is offered I do not know. The committee seems to have yielded upon this proposition for some reason or other. Many of the girls of this country are being weaned away from the home life, which they ought to learn to respect, and encouraged to go into the mills, factories, and foundries, if you please, for the purpose of competing with men.

The industrial schools in Philadelphia have an honorable history. One of the best of them was organized by private contributions, but was compelled to abandon its work largely



because the students of that school could not obtain employment in the trades in which they became competent, because of union-labor regulations. And if we are to train girls to be mill workers, train them to compete with the men, take them away from the homes, make home life humiliating to them, why, then, perhaps, we had better adopt an amendment limiting the amount of teaching there shall be for those of our daughters whom we hope will be kept out of the mills, and who, contracting honorable marriages, may be able to manage a home rather than to depend upon somebody else in an apartment house or hotel to manage a home for them. I want to see the youth of this country properly educated on vocational lines. I want to see the boy master his job. I would like to see the housewife able to conduct the affairs of the home, and I would not confine her to the mill. Neither would I limit this public benefaction we are conferring upon the States, so that only 20 per cent of the young women would be able to manage a home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I stated that there was a most unfortunate misapprehension upon the part of some Members of this House as to the purposes and objects of this bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has now revealed himself as being one of those Members who are under a total misapprehension of the purposes and objects of this bill. He does not seem to have gathered any of the principles that lie behind this bill.

Why, he talks of this amendment that I have proposed as proposing to educate only 20 per cent of the girls in home economics and compel 80 per cent of them to be educated for the mills. Why, if the gentleman would read this bill before he undertook to get up on the floor and debate it, he would furnish more information to the Members of the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Apart from home economics, which the gentleman would limit to 20 per cent, what else are these teachers to teach except trade and industrial subjects?

Mr. LENROOT. Trade and industrial subjects.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is all. Eighty per cent trade and industrial subjects and 20 per cent for domestic economics.

Mr. LENROOT. The purpose of this bill, as has been stated time and time again by Members on both sides on this floor, and the purpose revealed in the bill itself, if the gentleman will take the trouble to read it, is not that this money is to be used to furnish the education of these boys and girls, but to stimulate the States into doing for themselves what they ought to do; and this limitation is for this purpose: That where a State furnishes the home economic education, as my State is doing, and as I hope the gentleman's State is doing, there is no occasion for invoking aid from the Federal Government where the State is doing it for itself.

But let us see what the gentleman's position would lead him to. He desires no limitation. That means that every dollar provided by this bill could be drawn from the Treasury and used in a State for home economics alone. That would mean that in the State of Pennsylvania they could draw all this money for the purpose of educating girls alone in home economics and deprive the girls and boys of the gentleman's district in Philadelphia of the privilege of receiving a vocational education in training and industry.

The purpose of this amendment is to make this bill do that which it is intended to do—to stimulate the States into doing those things which the States either are not doing now at all or are not doing in such a way as to provide practical vocational training for the boys and girls of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the question of home economics was fully considered by the President's commission in three months' study, and our information was that home economics was being very well cared for in almost every State and in almost every city of the country. The question immediately arose that if you were to appropriate for that particular subject, every school would get a portion of it and there would certainly not be money to go to any one school large enough in its sum to amount to anything. Consequently the commission's report omitted it entirely. The Senate bill omitted it. Our original bill omitted it. But in our committee the matter was taken up and the argument was pretty strongly pressed that

we ought to recognize home-economics teaching as well as home-economic training. The committee had already recognized the latter; that is, money paid to institutions for the training of teachers, but not for the payment of salaries of teachers teaching these subjects. So that home economics was placed in the House bill, and is in the bill now.

The committee, I think, would agree to allowing it to be limited to 20 per cent along the line of what has been suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], not because there is any opposition to home economics; furthest from it. There are 12,000,000 boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 16 that are in the agricultural field to-day. There are 12,660,000, to be exact. There are 14,250,000 that are in urban life; in the rural population a little less than in the urban population. There was no provision for home economics in the agricultural appropriation of \$3,000,000. There is a provision for home economics in the trade and industrial lines.

Now, if we devote all of the \$3,000,000 to agriculture, that will go to one class of our population engaged in one thing. If we devote the \$3,000,000 to urban population, it will be divided among home economics and trade schools and industrial schools which are not equivalent to trade schools. We ought to make a distinction between those, and in that way it would seem to me that probably, unless we limit the amount for home economics, there might be some misfortune that we do not want admitted into the bill. Personally—and I think I can speak for the members of the committee—we would be willing to vote for a limitation upon the amount to go to this particular fund, and I shall vote for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a question.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the committee, I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering whether, from the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio, he was endeavoring to impress the House with the fact that the expenditures under the authorization in this bill would be made in segregated institutions such as I described when I was talking on the bill.

Mr. FESS. That would have to be left entirely with your State board.

Mr. MADDEN. The only conclusion I could reach from what the gentleman said was that he believed in having special plants created for the teaching of special lines of instruction.

Mr. FESS. The bill provides that the State board must submit all plans, and must establish a plant by State expenditure, and that plan and plant must be approved by the Federal board.

Mr. HUGHES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One moment. There has been no action taken upon the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I do not think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] can pass an amendment by merely accepting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 60, noes 7.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: Page 6, line 2, after the words "\$50,000," strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following:

"Provided, That the words 'industrial subjects' when used in this act shall include cooperative credit and business."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BENNET. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I should like to offer, and to discuss for a few moments.



The CHAIRMAN. This request is as to the pending amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, judging from the fate which my amendment received this morning it is probable that this amendment will not carry, although I hope it will. This morning I was talking about the importance of cooperative credit among the farmers. Now, this section provides for the teaching of industrial subjects and the training of teachers to teach those subjects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] seemed to think that my whole interest was in the farmers—that they should be provided with better credit—but that is not true. During the last few years we have been studying better credit facilities, especially for the farmers; and I wish to say that the European countries have also provided cooperative credit institutions for persons engaged in industrial pursuits, for small dealers, for small traders, for small merchants, while in this country we have made no progress in that direction. Now, take our banks as a whole, if I remember correctly they have invested and loaned out about \$20,000,000,000. One-half of that entire amount is loaned to the corporations of this country. This does not mean that I am attacking the corporations, but it does mean that the advantages of credit in our banks are used to make money for the corporations. That fact has been recognized in Europe, and hence European countries have provided cooperative credit societies, not only for the corporations and for the owners of farms, but also for the persons of small means in the towns and cities. The history of those institutions shows that they have contributed immensely to the advantage and benefit of the poor. I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to this matter. In the last few years, when we have been trying to provide better credit facilities for the farmers and the men who largely represent agricultural districts, what has been done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other man representing a great city constituency to provide better credit facilities for the poor men in the great cities of our country? In the great cities of Europe there are special institutions through which men can purchase homes on terms and at a rate of interest not duplicated here in the United States.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DALLINGER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he is at all familiar with the work of the cooperative banks in Massachusetts and with the fact that thousands and tens of thousands of workmen have been able to obtain homes through them?

Mr. BENNET. Is the gentleman also familiar with the system in operation in New York by which a street car conductor can borrow the money to buy his uniform when he gets a job on a street car, and anybody else in a similar situation can do the same thing?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am somewhat familiar with what both these gentlemen call attention to, and yet I know that in our great cities as a whole the poor man is without credit facilities. Our banks are loaning their money to the great corporations and the great merchants, and the man of small means does not have access to credit facilities, as he does in Europe.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that while we were giving \$15,000,000 out of the Public Treasury to start farm-loan associations for the benefit of the farmer, we in the cities had already provided ourselves, out of our own funds, with building associations by which the workmen were obtaining homes in the cities?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. The building and loan associations are doing a great work—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman would recognize that they were.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. But it is comparatively insignificant compared to the great field that is open.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that we in the cities are paying the farmer the highest prices he has ever received for all that he produces?

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I should like to know what bill the gentleman from Pennsylvania has presented—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The farmer is receiving now the highest prices for everything that he produces, from eggs to potatoes.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I am not now discussing the problems of the farmer. This amendment applies to cooperative credit for the millions in our great cities. There is a great field for the activities of both Federal and State authorities.

In this bill we are appropriating many millions of dollars. We are entering a new field for the National Government. We should see to it that these funds are utilized in a way that will not only make the farmer and mechanic a larger producer of products in his line but will give both the farmer and mechanic greater profit on his labors. This will be done by promoting cooperation in business and credit among our farmers and wage earners throughout every section of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The debate is open to anyone who desires to oppose the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is the best friend of the Oklahoma farmer on this floor, with apologies, of course, to the other Representatives from Oklahoma. Next to them he takes the rag off the bush. He is for the farmer who is now "bleeding" because he can not get anything (?) for his cotton down in Oklahoma. The poor farmer down in Oklahoma, getting \$100 a bale, is impoverished just now, because we do not give him a little more rural credit.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Wait a minute. My heart bleeds for the downtrodden farmer of Oklahoma. I have heard so much from my friend from Oklahoma that I feel I can sympathize with him from the very depths of my heart; but I want to tell the gentleman that we have been buying eggs lately up our way, and they have cost us as high as a dollar a dozen, and the farmer has been getting it, except the very little slice that the gentleman thinks goes to the middleman who builds the railroad to get the eggs up from Oklahoma, or from somewhere out in Kansas, so we can get them at a dollar a dozen in Philadelphia and New York.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Surely.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. I want to ask what the gentleman has done in this Congress, we will say, in an effort to provide better facilities for the laboring men and the small business men of his State with better credit?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have tried hard to have a few canals built to improve transportation [laughter] in order that the laboring man might have work and the farmer facilities for getting his crops to the market, but at such times the gentleman from Oklahoma could not see anything but the Oklahoma farmer, who seems to keep himself within the confines of his own State. I want communication with Texas and with Oklahoma, and if we can not get it by rail I want it by water. I know if we get it by water we will keep hundreds and thousands of people employed in the transportation business, which is a middleman's business, so that the farmer can get higher prices for his cotton and eggs. [Laughter.] Why, a little talk of this kind is educational. This is an educational vocation bill, and the farmers, those who support this bill, want to limit the right of the teachers who are to be paid out of the Public Treasury to educate their children in home economics; they want them taught a higher form of college art—to trip the light fantastic toe, and let the mothers and fathers do the work. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly; any gentleman from Oklahoma is welcome now. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. I want to know if the gentleman in his generosity would bring his interoceanic canal to Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; if I could get in, but it takes all our money to help the gentleman from Oklahoma irrigate farms of 40 acres, at \$7,500 per farm, whereas if we had a small proportion of the sum the gentleman gets for his semi-arid farms we could take care of most of his population in two counties in New Jersey.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not get my support for his interoceanic canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have always supported the gentleman in his arid-land schemes, and I observe the gentleman always takes the public money for that purpose and always does it in the name of the farmer, without regard to the fact that he is making the farmer pay the taxes; but the farmer is making so much money now that by and by the income tax will reach him as it reaches Carnegie and Rockefeller. From the reports I have here the farmers of the West are making barrels of money, while in the East we are paying European-war prices for everything we eat. The "downtrodden farmer" is buying his fine limousines, with which he goes to church and the moving-picture shows just now. He is having a most delightful time in the gentleman's country and my people are paying the bill. Sometimes when I get up and call attention to these facts the gentleman from Oklahoma rises and wants to know what we



have done in the city to relieve the situation. We have at least tried to call attention to the fact that the farmer is getting it all. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out all of the section after the word "census," line 3, on page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York proposes an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 5, by striking out the proviso beginning after the word "census" down to and including line 2, on page 6.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. BENNET. I object. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the purpose of this proviso, it is to make it possible that States that do not earn the minimum under this bill by their own contribution, or who are not entitled to it by population, either rural or urban, shall nevertheless get the minimum sum. It strikes me that that is unfair. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] awhile ago started a very scholarly speech—and he was scholarly all the while he talked and some time he will conclude it—but he called attention to the change of situation that some day Congress must take into account. The wealthy States are now contributing all out of proportion to the population, and receiving from the National Treasury sometimes up to the proportion of their population but not always.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not the gentleman realize that the prosperity of New York, the great metropolis, is founded not alone upon the local business of New York but the general prosperity of the country?

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman from Missouri has made the next sentence in my speech. I think I might have made it just as well. I agree with him. We are all one country, and Oklahoma can not prosper unless New York does, and New York can not prosper unless Oklahoma does. I recognize the propriety of taxing wealth, even though that wealth happens to be in the State which I in part represent.

But I am certain of this fact, not in connection with this particular bill so much, that if taxation continues to be ingeniously added to the wealth and spread out as little as possible over population there will come a time when the old spirit of our forefathers that rebelled against taxation without representation will rebel again—this time against unequal taxation. I do not object because States which contribute less are under this bill getting just as much per person for rural and urban education as is New York. It would be grotesque to insist that because New York happens to contribute six or eight times as much per capita as some States to the National Treasury her children in the rural communities should receive six times the per capita for education that the children of the other States do; but it does seem to me that the large contributing States have a legitimate objection to the provision that States which do not either by population or by their own contributions make themselves eligible to receive the sums stipulated in this bill, shall receive them, nevertheless, as a minimum, simply because Congress wants to give them to them.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The principle upon which the minimum requirement is written is that if you do not make a contribution of a certain size it will be too small other than to be just frittered away. The rural population of Wyoming is two-tenths of 1 per cent of the rural population of the United States, and under the provision of allotment it would get about \$1,050. The \$1,050 appropriated to Wyoming for any purpose of education would be so small that it would be frittered away, and it ought to receive at least \$5,000 or nothing. Its industrial population is only one-tenth of 1 per cent. There are 4 States which would be beneficiaries in industrial matters and 16 States in agricultural matters, and that is why that minimum provision was inserted.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, this bill, on the whole, is so fairly drawn that the particular amounts mentioned in it really amount to very little. It was not to them especially that I was addressing myself; but, if I may use the phrase, I was indulging in a little bit of a look into the future. As my days here are numbered, I wish to leave my contribution toward the problem that those of you who will succeed me in the Sixty-fifth and other Congresses will have to face. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] will have to face it, as will the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and so on, in the large contributing States on which are being piled yearly and on which in this Congress will be piled additional burdens of taxation—not according to the population, but according to their wealth. They will, sooner or later, have to face a feeling among the constituencies which elect them that if a certain proportion of the taxation comes from their States, then a certain proportion of the moneys put out in this way ought to go back to those States. I do not think that feeling is entirely fair, but I think it is the part of proper statesmanship to recognize now that the danger of that feeling does exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. I think it is the part of proper statesmanship at the earliest moment when this new system of direct taxation is novel among us to be facing the problems that that system is going to bring about.

Right in connection with that I want to say a word or two about the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], who asked those of us from the city what we have done to enlarge the credit facilities of the people in the cities. We have not done anything in the Sixty-fourth Congress, because there is no place on the face of the footstool where the credit facilities of the poor man are better than in the large cities. We do not believe in creating Government enterprises to do that which is already well done by private enterprise. I will tell you what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] and I could do to-morrow morning, and he and I are possibly about the same age—both of us over 40. We could land in New York City to-morrow morning, and with not 1 cent in the world we could go to the Bowery Young Men's Christian Association, where we could be trusted in the beginning with more credit than we would be entitled to according to our visible wealth if we had no money. We could be trusted from the beginning for our food and shelter, and in addition that institution would undertake the contract of finding employment for us suitable to what we could do. I speak now of the case of the very poorest man. Supposing we got what we could get, a job on the elevated railroad or the subway, we could go to the Morris Plan Bank in New York City, and we could get the money to buy the uniform that would be necessary, and then go right back there to that Young Men's Christian Association in the Bowery, and they would continue to trust us, at least for our board and shelter, until the first pay day. If we were mechanics and had tools, we could make arrangements by which we could retain our tools, and the Provident Loan Association would loan us money upon the apparent credit caused by the fact that we had tools. If we were merchants in a small way and needed as small a sum as \$50, there are at least a half dozen State banks in the city of New York, which under our State law have local branches in the different sections of the city which would be glad to loan us seventy-five or fifty or one hundred dollars to carry on our little business.

In a big city a man who has character and willingness to work and ability to work never has to complain of the lack of proper means of credit up to the amount of credit that he ought to have. That is the reason why we have not done anything in this Congress, and why the Representatives from the city will not do anything in the Sixty-fifth or the Sixty-sixth or the Sixty-seventh Congress or thereafter. The large cities have facilities such as I have described. Take the smaller towns in the States like Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and New York. Let us take the case of a brakeman on a railroad and let us suppose that he saves up \$150. With that he can buy a lot in a city up to as large as 10,000 inhabitants, and with nothing in the world but that \$150 lot and his job he can go to the building and loan association and borrow money at 5 per cent with which to build his entire house, and have 14 years in which to pay it back.

I have indicated only one place where the gentleman and I, if penniless, could nevertheless immediately obtain more credit than our financial condition really warranted.

There are many such. If we were Hebrews, we could go to the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society or the Young Men's Hebrew Association or the Hebrew Sheltering Home of Harlem.

Protestant Christians, as we are, we could nevertheless go to the Hebrew Free Loan Association and obtain a small loan, without interest, for the association makes loans to all creeds



and races among the poor, and always without interest, because the law of Moses says (Exodus xxii: 25):

If thou lend money to any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as an usurer; neither shalt thou lay upon him usury.

"Usury" is used here in the ancient sense and is synonymous with "interest." There is no place where credit for those who have character, but no assets, is so easy to obtain as in a large city. The feelings of those in smaller communities are as kindly, but their impulses are unorganized. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] seems surprised that the banks loan large sums principally to rich people. They do this because rich people can repay large loans and give good security. No sound system of banking has yet been devised by which large sums of money can be safely and profitably loaned to irresponsible people. But the poor man in a large city can borrow far more money than his financial standing alone would permit and far more than any properly conducted Government enterprise ought ever to be permitted to loan him.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of cooperating with the States in preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects and teachers of trade and industrial and home economics subjects there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the use of the States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$700,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$900,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$1,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall be not less than a minimum of \$5,000 for any fiscal year prior to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, nor less than \$10,000 for any fiscal year thereafter. And of the sums herein authorized to be appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment provided for in this section: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$32,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$24,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$90,000.

Mr. POWERS and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWERS: On page 6, line 4, strike out the word "preparing" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors engaged in training."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported last February. The committee intended to get together and run over any amendment which any member of the committee might want to offer, but we had no opportunity to do that. Since the report of the committee on this bill certain objections have reached me as to the word "preparing." Section 2 of the bill is predicated upon the theory of appropriating \$3,000,000 a year after 1925 for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach agricultural subjects. Section 3 of the bill is predicated upon the theory of paying \$3,000,000 annually after 1925 for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach trade and home economic subjects. Section 4 of the bill, the one to which I offer my amendment, is predicated upon a little bit different theory from either section 2 or section 3. Section 4 provides that the Federal Government shall expend \$1,000,000 a year after the year 1920. I believe it is, for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to teach or to train people how to teach these various subjects—agriculture, home economics, and industrial subjects. The purpose of this bill is that the \$1,000,000 shall be expended in paying the salaries of teachers to train other teachers to teach these subjects. The objection has been raised that if the word "preparing" is left in the bill the normal schools of the country will largely take over this entire fund. Now, there is no purpose on the part of the committee or any member of it to deprive the normal schools of their full share of this fund, but my amendment provides that this

\$1,000,000 a year shall go to paying the salaries of teachers in training these various folks to teach these various subjects. The word "prepare" means to equip, to fit out, to provide with whatever is appropriate and necessary; that covers more ground and includes many for which this money ought not to be expended. My amendment does not change the purposes of the bill as it has been framed by the committee, but it makes sure that this money shall be used for the purpose for which it was intended.

Mr. HUGHES and Mr. WALSH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], the chairman of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the committee has carefully considered this bill line by line and section by section, and we have agreed that the word "preparing" is a proper one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the section and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate upon this measure and am led to the conclusion that a Federal appropriation is a wonderfully efficacious thing to furnish stimulation to the States.

Now, the matter of education is a duty that either rests upon the State or it does not rest upon the State. If there is a demand that the youth of the land be educated along vocational lines that demand should be sufficient to force the States to take care of and provide that sort of education. If an appropriation such as this is justified, and if legislation of this sort is warranted, when coupled with an appropriation, then we here would be warranted in passing a bill saying to the States, "You shall furnish this education, although we make no appropriation therefor." And if there is need for this stimulation, I say, Congress ought to pass a law requiring every State within the Union to furnish this sort of legislation at their own expense, at least that is the way this scheme ought to be inaugurated.

Already nine States, we have been told, have embarked upon this program, and if nine States can do that, paying the expense out of their own treasury, why can not all States in the Union adopt that same program?

The proper way, I submit, for a project of this sort to be handled would be for the Nation to create and establish a national university or a series of universities which would be under distinct Federal control. But, it is said, we have embarked upon this policy in the road appropriation. Yes; we have, and I am credibly informed that one of the great enterprising States of the Middle West, through agitation in the newspapers, by the leading newspapers of that State, and by citizens interested in the subject within that State, will not probably undertake to cooperate with the Federal Government in the improvement of roads. And a spirit of resentment is going forth throughout that State because they realize it is an encroachment upon the powers and duties that belong distinctively to the Commonwealth, and such stimulation is not looked on with favor. And so I feel that I probably can not support this measure in this form. I believe that if nine States can do this without the wonderful stimulant of a Federal appropriation, the other States can see to it that they will do it. They say, "Oh, \$1,500 will accomplish nothing for Wyoming; therefore we will make a minimum appropriation of \$5,000." Yes; they sought to do that in the road bill by giving them a gratuity of \$6,500, but after that bill came back to this body it was found that a change had been wrought in it. It was agreed to in the form in which it came here. There should at least be some equitable scheme devised whereby each State should receive its share, if it be justified, and that instead of stimulation with Federal funds we might well enact a compulsory statute minus the appropriation, which will in no certain terms bring the States to a realization of their duty in this respect. What a spectacle is presented when States will brazenly admit they neglect their duty in regard to educational matters, but are willing to fulfill them if Uncle Sam will help bear the expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided for in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate or create a State board, consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power to cooperate, as herein provided, with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the ad-



ministration of the provisions of this act. The State board of education, or other board having charge of the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State may, if the State so elect, be designated as the State board, for the purposes of this act.

Any State may accept the benefits of any one or more of the respective funds herein authorized to be appropriated, and it may defer the acceptance of the benefits of any one or more of such funds, and shall be required to meet only the conditions relative to the fund or funds the benefits of which it has accepted: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1918, no State shall receive any appropriation for salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects until it shall have taken advantage of at least the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects, as provided for in this act, and that after said date no State shall receive any appropriation for the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects until it shall have taken advantage of at least the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, as provided for in this act.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 5, after the word "and," strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWERS. I offered an amendment myself. I am a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is also a member of the committee. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky later.

Mr. POWERS. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair was not aware of the fact that I offered my amendment awhile ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances I will withdraw my amendment for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his amendment temporarily, and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. POWERS: Page 8, line 7, strike out the word "until" and substitute the word "unless," and on line 13 strike out the word "until" and substitute the word "unless."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that after June 30, 1920—I believe it has been so amended—"no State shall receive any appropriations for salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects until it shall have taken advantage at least of the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers." Now, that word "until" evidently ought to be "unless," and the same thing is true in the subsequent line 13.

If there is no opposition to it, I will say no more at this time and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection whatever to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. POWERS. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 22; noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] offers an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Page 7, line 12, after the word "designate" insert the words "the State department of education."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, section 5 of the bill provides—

That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided for in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate or create a State board, consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power to cooperate, as herein provided, with the Federal board of vocational education in the administration of the provisions of this act.

In the State of Alabama and some other States there is no State board of education. The public-school system is under the direction and supervision of a State officer, designated as the "superintendent of education." There is some doubt as to whether the Legislature of Alabama under its constitution would have the power to comply with this requirement.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. With pleasure.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask my colleague whether the extension of the time from 1918 to 1920 would not overcome the very obstacle or trouble of which he complains?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, the extension of the time from 1918 to 1920 would remove this obstacle if it were certain that our legislature has the power under its constitution to create a State board of education. We had a State board of education at one time, provided for in the constitution of the State. As a substitute for that board our constitutional conventions of 1875 and 1901 created a State department of education, to be under the direction of a State officer, known as the "superintendent of education."

I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in order that there may be no doubt that my State will be able to meet this requirement, and I trust that the committee will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I got the full force of the amendment to line 12.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The amendment which I offer, Mr. Chairman, provides that after the word "designate," in line 12, page 7, section 5, the words "the State department of education" be inserted. If this amendment should be adopted, the section would read as follows: "Any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate the State department of education, or create a State board consisting of not less than three members, and having all necessary power," and so forth.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to meet the requirements of my friend from Alabama, but I think that changes entirely what the bill wants to do. We want to do this work through a State board. Now, in my own State we have not a State board of education, but we ought to have, and I feel that if Ohio will not meet the requirements by creating a State board of education, she will be honestly and worthily punished for not doing it, and I am speaking advisedly, because I know of the constitution in my State. I would like to keep the requirement that all of this fund must be apportioned and applied through the State board of education, and not through any particular individual who might be called the head of the State board.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Is it possible under your State constitution for your legislature to create a State board of education?

Mr. FESS. Without a doubt.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am not certain that it is possible under our State constitution, in view of the fact that we at one time had a constitutional provision establishing a State board of education, for which we substituted a provision establishing a State department of education under the direction of a superintendent of education.

Mr. BORLAND. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a question.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. What virtue is there in administration by a board greater than in administration by a State educational department or superintendent?

Mr. FESS. The work of education in a State is sufficiently important that there ought to be an organization with complete control of the educational work, and every State in the United States, with a very few exceptions, has a State board. Some of our States, however, have neglected to take on that particular phase of educational organization.

Mr. BORLAND. Is not a board a rather clumsy method of doing business?

Mr. FESS. No; not if it is a small board.

Mr. BORLAND. There is a tendency to create more boards than we really need. In fact, I very gravely doubt—and it is my one doubt about this bill—whether we need this Federal education board, and whether it would not be entirely better and



more efficient and appropriate to have it managed by the Federal superintendent of education or Commissioner of Education.

Mr. FESS. I think the work is so very comprehensive that it ought to have a board of managers well equipped for this particular work.

Mr. BORLAND. It sounds very well to speak of a board of high-class men, but in my State we have found that we have more boards than we need, and that it results in a great deal of lost motion and lost efficiency; and I heard the governor elect of my State announce that he proposed to consolidate a large number of our State boards into fewer organizations and fewer hands, which struck me as being a very good reform.

Mr. FESS. That is all right, to centralize these duties.

Mr. KELLEY. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], if the amendment is inserted as stated after the word "designate," whether that would not preclude the designation of the State board where one already exists?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. No; because the following sentence states specifically that the State board, where it exists, may be designated.

Mr. KELLEY. Your amendment being put in after the word "designate," then how would it read? Please read that once more.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Beginning in line 11—

Any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate the State department of education, or create a State board—

Mr. KELLEY. Or create a State board?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes. Further on it is provided that the State board of education or other board having charge of the administration of public education in the State, or any State board having charge of the administration of any kind of vocational education in the State, may, if the State so elects, be designated as the State board for the purposes of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to ask one or two questions with regard to this matter. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] asked the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] whether under his constitution the State legislature had the right to create a board of education. Now, of course, it is a fact that boards of education and State educational departments are created in the constitutions of some States, and it would be impossible to change the department without changing the constitution.

Mr. FESS. It is not intended to change the department. It just adds one thing.

Mr. PLATT. If the State constitution creates an educational department, there would be no opportunity to create a board of education without changing the constitution.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That is exactly the trouble in Alabama, and in that connection I desire to read a telegram which I received a few days ago from Hon. William F. Feagin, the State superintendent of education for Alabama. It reads as follows:

Before passing vocational bill see that proper amendment makes it possible for Alabama to get benefit immediately, as you know our legislature does not meet until 1919, and the constitution of the State does not allow a State board of education.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will withdraw his request for a moment, after this section is perfected I propose to make a motion to strike out the section, and I want five minutes on the motion to strike out.

Mr. HUGHES. Then make it 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. My motion would not be in order until the others are disposed of.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I have one or two other amendments that I desire to offer to this section.

Mr. HUGHES. Then I withdraw my request.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Amend section 5 as follows: Add to the conclusion of line 16, on page 8, the following:

"Provided, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature held after the passage of this act, the assent of the governor of the State shall be sufficient, and until that time the governor of such State may designate the agency to cooperate with the Federal board of vocational education under the provisions of this act."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, in a number of the States, my own being among them, the legislatures will not meet again in regular session until 1919. This amendment is offered for the purpose of making it possible for such States to participate in the distribution of these funds prior to that time without the necessity for special sessions of their legislatures. I might say that the first part of the proposed amendment is expressed in the exact language used in a similar amendment to the Federal roads bill. As Members will recall, that bill provided for acceptance through the State legislatures, but in order to render it possible for States to share in that fund prior to the regular meetings of their legislatures the bill was amended after this fashion.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Does not the change of dates in the bill as we have amended it meet the requirements of the gentleman's State?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Only in part. Under the terms of the bill there is no way for a State to participate in the use of any of the funds until its legislature has accepted and designated the agency to cooperate with the Federal board for vocational education.

Mr. FESS. Does my friend believe that it is wise legislation to make a provision that this must be accepted by the legislative action and then make an exception to it?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The proposed exception is temporary. It is to continue only until the legislature has had an opportunity to act. I submit that it would be unfair to compel a State to call a special session of its legislature, which would probably cost more than the State's first annual allotment, or forego for a period of two years the benefits to be derived by acceptance.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, Congress can not grant authority to the governor of any State to accept the provisions of any act.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am not sure about that. Congress granted such authority to governors in the act providing Federal aid to the States for improving and constructing public roads.

Mr. LENROOT. Whether it did or not, Congress has no authority to grant authority to the governor of a State to bind the State. Is not that true?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, there is precedent for such action by Congress, and it occurs to me that the need, in this instance, is as great as it was in the good-roads legislation. Is haste in the construction of public highways of greater importance than promptness in the vocational training of our boys and girls who are growing into manhood and womanhood by the thousands day by day?

Mr. LENROOT. It must be granted, of course, that Congress can not authorize the governor of a State to bind the State, and then I want to ask by what authority the governor, in the absence of legislative authority, can bind the State?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That raises a constitutional question that I am not prepared to answer. If the granting temporarily of such authority is unconstitutional, it is a matter that has been overlooked heretofore in other legislation, notably the act providing Federal aid to roads.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think my friend from Alabama will insist on that amendment. Of course the very object of the bill is to submit to the people of a State through its legislature the question of whether they will accept the provisions of the act and give power to the governor to accept the various provisions of the act. To give the power to the governor would be an utter subversion of the purposes of the bill. I do not know whether he would have the constitutional right to act upon it, but I am very sure that he would not have the authority to bind the State. The legislature could repudiate his action if it desired. I think it would involve the bill in very grave embarrassment, and I hope the gentleman will not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.



The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. Mr. Chairman, this is the section which provides that before the States can obtain the benefits of this act they shall severally appropriate an amount equal to the amount to be allotted under the rules and regulations to be laid down. I do not believe in that character of legislation. I recognize the Federal Government as one sovereign entity, and I recognize the several State governments as sovereign entities.

I do not believe that the Federal Government ought to make an appropriation from the Federal Treasury to be expended in a State for any purpose and place upon it a limitation that it shall not be expended in that State unless the State itself responds in an equal amount.

Gentlemen say that this bill is not designed to destroy the autonomy of the States. It is not upon its face. And yet, what is the situation? The Federal Government, under the terms of this bill, will say to a State—well, say the State of Illinois, for example—"Here is \$10,000, provided you tax yourselves in an equal amount. I have already taxed you to obtain this \$10,000, which we now come and offer to you provided you tax yourselves again to raise an equal amount."

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is on the wrong section. Section 8 is what he talks about, but we are on section 5.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I will let my remarks apply to section 8 when we get to it, and I will complete my speech. If the State of Illinois says, "No; we do not choose to tax ourselves \$10,000," then the Federal Government will say, "Very well; give us \$1,000 and we will take that and distribute it among other States." The State of Illinois will obtain nothing under the provisions of this act unless it taxes itself in an equal amount, and yet gentlemen say that it does not propose to coerce the State. It is proposed, just as was in the roads bill, to coerce the State through the most powerful instrumentality of coercion that now exists in this country, and that is through the use of the taxing power.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that that principle ought to apply in legislation. I repeat what I said earlier in the day if the Federal vocational bill is essential, let it be a Federal vocational education bill, and let us not undertake—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman think that the Federal Government would have the right to impose a vocational education bill on the people of a State?

Mr. GARRETT. I doubt that very much; but the State might be willing to submit to that imposition. As a legal proposition it might not have the right. But I do undertake to say that it is bad policy to enter into this arrangement whereby you practically coerce a State to send one dollar after another, or are you proceeding on the principle, "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath"? Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TOWNER. Will not the gentleman withdraw his amendment to section 5?

Mr. GARRETT. I think in the proviso, if I interpret the language correctly—

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely mistaken. It is in section 8 that the requisite for State action is made.

Mr. GARRETT. It would be absolutely necessary if section 8 goes out that this section shall go out also, would it not be?

Mr. TOWNER. I think not. Of course, if the gentleman desires to insist upon his amendment, well and good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That a Federal board for vocational education is hereby created, to consist of the United States Commissioner of Education, who shall be chairman of the said board, and four associate members, no more than two of whom shall be of any one political party, to be appointed by the President. In the first instance two members shall be appointed for two years and two for four years, and all subsequent appointments shall be for four years. The associate members of the board shall each receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. The board shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act. It shall be the duty of the Federal board for vocational education to make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports, with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics. Such studies, investigations, and reports shall include agriculture and agricultural processes and requirements upon agricultural workers, trades, industries, and apprenticeships, trade and industrial requirements upon industrial workers, and classification of industrial processes and pursuits, commerce and commercial pursuits and requirements upon commercial workers, home management, domestic science, and the study of related

facts and principles, and problems of administration of vocational schools and of courses of study and instruction in vocational subjects.

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning agriculture, for the purposes of agricultural education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Agriculture; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries, for the purposes of trade and industrial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning commerce and commercial pursuits, for the purposes of commercial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Commerce; such studies, investigations, and reports concerning the administration of vocational schools, courses of study and instruction in vocational subjects, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Bureau of Education.

The Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules, regulations, and decisions which the board may adopt. The Federal board for vocational education shall have power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. POWERS rose.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if we can not agree on some time in which to discuss this section? It is growing late, and we are very anxious indeed to complete this bill this afternoon.

Mr. POWERS. I shall only consume a very little time myself.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to agree upon some time in order that we may expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that this is really the only controverted section in the bill. I would not like to see the time limited at this time. I have several amendments that I desire to offer.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that it is possible to complete the bill to-night, much as I would like to do so.

Mr. LENROOT. I suggest that we go on and take an amendment at a time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. POWERS: Amend section 6, page 8, by striking out all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive, on page 8, and the words "per annum," on page 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. That a Federal board for vocational education is hereby created to consist of the United States Commissioner of Education and four citizens of the United States, to be appointed by the President; one of said four citizens shall be a representative of manufacturing interest, one a representative of commercial interest other than manufacturing, one a representative of labor, and one a representative of agriculture. The board shall elect annually one of its members as chairman. In the first instance two members shall be appointed for two years, and two for four years, and all subsequent appointments shall be for four years. The members of the board, other than the United States Commissioner of Education, shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the pending Smith-Hughes bill, providing for national aid to vocational education, has been heralded far and wide as a Democratic measure. Vocational education as defined in the bill means that kind of practical education which is designed to prepare girls and boys for useful employment or occupation. Its purpose is to prepare workers for the more common occupations in which the great mass of our people find useful employment. The bill will soon become a law, and in the next political campaign it will be proudly spoken of by Democratic orators as one of the great achievements of the Democratic Party, and especially of this administration.

One not conversant with the facts would be led to believe that the Democratic Party is the grandfather of vocational education and the great-grandfather of national aid to same, and but for its wise statesmanship the world would never have had the slightest conception of what vocational education really means to the individual or to the Nation, whether procured through national aid or otherwise. No Republican will be given any credit for having had anything to do in helping to bring vocational education about, and especially national aid therefor; for was it not President Wilson who said in his Indianapolis speech that the Republican Party had not had a new idea in the last 30 years? Under the circumstances a brief review of the efforts to secure national aid for vocational education in this country will not be amiss. Let me say now that the real worth of vocational education to the individual and to the Nation, and especially national aid therefor, so far as this country is concerned, was largely conceived in Republican brains and pushed forward by Republican hands. In 1862 Justin S. Morrill, then a Representative from the State of Vermont and later a Republican United States Senator from the same Commonwealth, introduced and secured the passage of what has since become known as the Morrill Agricultural College Act. He believed that the welfare of the country demanded special education along the lines of agriculture and



the mechanic arts. The original Morrill bill was vetoed by a Democratic President, James Buchanan, on the ground that education in all its forms was purely a State and local problem. He feared Federal aid would "cause the States to lean upon the National Government for the support of their own educational systems," as he expressed it in his veto. Abraham Lincoln, however, in 1862 signed the Morrill Agricultural College Act, which granted to the various States tracts of land on which to erect great agricultural and mechanical colleges for the purpose of training young men of college grade to become leaders in the great fields of agriculture and industry; and thus was established the policy of Federal aid to vocational education in this country.

#### OTHER LAWS FOLLOWED.

In the wake of this measure, which founded the agricultural and mechanical colleges, have come a series of congressional acts appropriating large sums of money and giving grants in furthering its purposes. Among these acts was one, in 1890, by Mr. Morrill himself. In 1887 Representative Hatch succeeded in passing through Congress a bill, since known as the Hatch Act, which provided an annual appropriation of \$15,000 to each State for the maintenance of an agricultural experiment station. Subsequently this was increased to \$30,000 per year. Other acts followed. Now an annual Federal appropriation of \$80,000 goes to each of the 48 States in the Union for the support of their agricultural and mechanical colleges and experiment stations. The Smith-Lever Act of 1913 commences with an annual appropriation of \$10,000 to each State for agricultural extension work, and this sum is increased from year to year until it finally reaches the average sum of \$95,000 to each State. Effective farm extension work is now carried on in not more than one-third of the counties in the United States, and probably less than one-fifth of the farmers have been reached at all. Only a few thousand of the farm women have been reached by extension work in household arts. Including the agricultural college in Porto Rico and the one in Honolulu, Hawaii, both of which this Government helps to support, there are now 52 white and 17 colored in all. They receive an annual cash appropriation of over \$4,000,000. The entire appropriation for their support has now reached the enormous sum of \$46,000,000, and this does not include the 15,000,000 acres of land which have been given for the benefit of our State universities and agricultural and mechanical colleges. I am speaking, of course, of Federal appropriations.

The several States have appropriated about fourteen times this amount; some put these figures less. Each of the 48 States in the Union has a great agricultural and mechanical college or university. Many of them owe their existence and all of them the great good they have done in large measure to the grants they have received from the Federal Government. The official reports of the 50 white agricultural and mechanical colleges and universities to the Bureau of Education for the year ending June 30, 1910, show that they had enrolled in that year 56,834 students. The Morrill Act and those following it have given to this country these high-grade colleges, whose thousands of highly skilled and essentially specialized graduates have added untold value not only to the so-called cultural side of education but also to our agricultural and industrial development. Nobody questions the great good that has been done. But great as has been the results flowing from the Morrill Act, still the good confidently hoped for by its author has not been realized. He believed that his bill would furnish to the country a great army of trained farmers; that the college student would return to the farm to invigorate farm life by greatly improved farm methods. This was his hope and his dream. Instead of its fruition, the colleges have turned out technicians in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and but few of these in comparison with the number of students attending these colleges and universities. Of the 56,834 students enrolled in these agricultural colleges and universities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, only 6,587 were agricultural students. The others were taking courses in English, history, mathematics, physics, and other sciences. Great as has been the results of the Morrill Act, it has failed to carry vocational education to the great masses of our people.

As I say, nobody denies its great achievements, but it has failed to send the farmer college boy back to the farm imbued with an enthusiasm for either agriculture or the industries or even their great possibilities.

#### OTHER REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TOOK A HAND.

Other Republican Members of Congress took up the task of extending national aid for vocational education so as to reach and better prepare for their labors, the man on the farm, the laborer in the mine, the housewife with her arduous house-

hold duties, the girl in the factory giving her young life to labors most uncongenial to her. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], now a distinguished Republican Member of this body, introduced a number of bills along these lines and devoted years of his life in pushing the cause along. The brilliant Senator Dolliver from Iowa, the sturdy and gifted Senators from Nebraska, Burkett and Pollard, Republicans all, introduced bills and furthered the cause for national aid to vocational education along useful and practical lines. The struggle went on. Other champions appeared upon the scene. Realizing that supplemental legislation was needed to the Morrill and allied acts, if the great mass of our people were to be reached and prepared for useful occupation in agriculture, industry, and home economics, Senator CARROLL S. PAGE, also a Republican United States Senator from the State of Vermont, began and for years has been giving the best efforts of his life to the solution of this great question. He fought hard to pass through the United States Senate a measure for Federal aid, which has since become known as the Page vocational education bill.

The proverbial uncertainty of American politics swept into the United States Senate a Democratic majority on March 4, 1913; and Senator HOKE SMITH of Georgia, became chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. Senator PAGE took his place in the ranks.

The substance of the Page bill was introduced by Senator SMITH, as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, following the report of a commission to investigate the question, and the measure then became the Smith bill. But let it ever be said to the credit of Senator SMITH that he has not tried to deprive Senator PAGE and other Republicans of the honor of fathering this great legislation. In a speech in the United States Senate on the 31st day of July, 1916, Senator SMITH, in speaking of the services of Senator PAGE, said:

The responsibility for the measure would have continued with him rather than to have fallen to me but for the change which took place in the organization of the Senate three years ago. With the Republican majority he was leading in the work and I was helping him. Since that time, as I am chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the situation is reversed just a little, but I am always glad to stop at any time the opportunity is presented to give to the Senator from Vermont every possible credit for his splendid work upon this subject and almost to regret that we have a Democratic majority and that he has not charge of the bill instead of myself.

The present distinguished chairman of the Educational Committee of the House, Mr. HUGHES, introduced a bill for vocational aid along the lines of the Smith bill, and the joint measure is now referred to as the Smith-Hughes bill. Every Republican on the Committee on Education, of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] is chairman, is giving this bill his enthusiastic support. Just a few moments ago the brilliant and able Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], made a masterly speech favoring this bill. The Republicans, in the main, are friends and champions of the cause. This, then, in brief, is the history of this soon-to-be legislation, and like other legislation conceived in Republican brains, has been taken over by this Democratic administration and heralded to the country as its very own.

#### WHAT THE PURPOSES OF THE BILL ARE.

What then in substance is the legislation for which Senator PAGE and other Republicans stood? What is the legislation proposed in the Smith-Hughes bill? What is vocational education as herein advocated and for which national aid is now proposed? What need is it intended to fit and fill that other education fails to reach? Why can we not depend and why do we not depend upon our great colleges, universities, and our splendid system of public schools for all the education of every character that we need? It should be remembered that we have more than 600 colleges and universities in the United States. The running expenses of our public schools now cost in round numbers \$600,000,000 every year. There are now, in round numbers, 30,000,000 children in this country between the ages of 6 and 20 years inclusive. About 50 per cent of these are urban or city children, 50 per cent live in the country. The history of education in this country shows that 40 per cent of these 30,000,000 children, or 12,000,000 of them, will have left school at the age of 14 years; 70 per cent, or 21,000,000 of them, will have left school by the time they are 15 years of age; and 85 per cent, or 25,500,000 of them, will have left school by the time they are 16 years of age, although every State in the Union, with the exception of six, have laws compelling parents to send their children to school. Less than 10 per cent of the 30,000,000 children will ever go through high school, and of those that do go through high school less than 2 per cent will graduate from a college or university. Only half the children who enter the city elementary schools of the country remain to the final elementary grade. One million of



them go out every year to join the great army of workers. They fill the vacant places caused by old age and death. At a pitifully young and inexperienced period of life they go out to face the cold, hard, sordid business world. They struggle through painful years of small wage and poor product.

If it should be said that these figures and these results are a pretty severe arraignment of the efficiency of our public-school system to reach the mass of our people, I shall have to admit that it is. If it should be said that 93 per cent—some put the figures as high as that—of our children should not stop school before they are 16 years of age, I readily agree that that is true. But the fact remains that they do stop. The fact remains that they leave school with inadequate general education and with no special education to fit them for life's work. The problems, then, confronting us are, What can we do to keep the children in school longer than they have been accustomed to go? What can we do for them while yet in school to better prepare them to meet the actual problems of life when they do go out? What can we do for those that have already gone and those that will go without that character of training that fits them to face without too great a disadvantage the real work of life before them? What can we do for our older and more mature people, male and female, now actually engaged in the real battle of life and many of them hard pressed by its stern necessities? That our present system of education is not measuring up to the real needs of the hour, nobody doubts or denies. That the courses of study in our present school system, collegiate, secondary, and common, are not sufficiently attractive and practical to keep the children and youths of our land, at ages frightfully young, from either going into idleness or the work of the world is proven by the painful truth that 85 per cent of the children leave school before they are 16 years of age and less than 2 per cent graduate from a college or university.

That the courses of study in our present school system are not practical enough and fail to connect, as they should, education with life, is abundantly proven by the all-to-many educated good-for-nothings and misfits in life. Our system of education ought to prepare people for the practical affairs of life and make them self-sustaining. Our theory of education and courses of study are predicated too largely upon the idea of preparing people for the professions.

#### WHERE THE BULK OF OUR PEOPLE WORK.

According to the census of 1910 there were 12,659,203 persons in the United States, both male and female, engaged in farming. There were 14,261,376 persons engaged in manufacturing, mechanical pursuits, and allied industries. Probably less than 1 per cent of those engaged in agriculture have had adequate preparation for so doing. This means, then, that there are over 12,000,000 people engaged in farming in the United States who have not been trained to deal with the soil through scientific methods in such a way as to make it yield what it should to the support of the present and future life of this Nation. It is equally correct to say that there is not 1 in 100 of the workers engaged in industrial pursuits that have had adequate training for the work in which they are engaged. A remedy ought to be found for this condition. Since less than 2 per cent of our children—largely the future citizens of our country—go through a college or university, and therefore less than 2 per cent of them are directly benefited by Federal grants to our agricultural and mechanical colleges, some way ought to be devised to reach and aid the other 98 per cent. That is partly the purpose of the bill before us. We must not be too sorely disappointed, though, if it fails to accomplish the object intended. It is a big problem we are tackling, and many there are who believe that we are not ready for Federal aid as provided for in this bill. Others believe that it is essentially a State and local problem and that the Government ought not to interfere. Others say that the courses of study in our schools should be modified so as to more adequately prepare people for the ordinary affairs of life, and that the reformation of our school system should come from within rather than from without.

I agree that there is much force of reasoning in the statement that the needed reform in our school system should come from within; and but for the conditions confronting us, as well as the imperative necessity for more practical training of the 25,000,000 workers now engaged in farming, mining, manufacturing, and the other occupations, as well as the other 1,000,000 workers that join the ranks of labor every year, I would be willing to let the States and local communities work out their own educational problems. But when we realize the great waste there is going on along agricultural lines—for example, the misdirected effort, the lack of proper yields from the soil, the high prices of all we consume, at least partly due to these

things—we are bound to come to the conclusion that something ought to be done.

#### THE BILL PROVIDES FOR AGRICULTURAL TRAINING.

Among other things, the bill before us offers Federal aid to each State, first, in the teaching and preparing teachers to teach agricultural subjects; second, in the teaching and preparing teachers to teach home economics, trade, and industrial subjects. I shall speak first of the proposed Federal grant to aid the States along agricultural lines.

Section 2 of the bill provides "that for the purpose of co-operating with the States in paying the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects" there is hereby authorized to be appropriated certain sums of money to the States each year till June 30, 1925, when it reaches the sum of \$3,000,000. Each year thereafter it is to be that sum. The sum allotted to each State will be in the proportion that its rural population bears to the entire rural population of the United States. Kentucky would be entitled, under this arrangement, to \$105,300 each year from the Federal Government. But before Kentucky or any other State would be permitted to share in these funds the State would have to match dollar for dollar with the Federal Government under the plans and arrangements provided for in the bill.

The instruction to be given must be under public supervision and control and "the controlling purpose of such education shall be to fit for useful employment; that such education shall be of less than college grade and be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon the work of the farm or the farm home." The bill provides that the schools in which any of the Federal money is to be expended "shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm for at least six months per year." The bill also provides for the expenditure on the part of the Federal Government of \$1,000,000 each year (the State putting up dollar for dollar) for the purpose of paying the salaries of teachers to train teachers to teach agricultural, trade, and home economic subjects.

#### THE IMPERATIVE NEED OF INTENSIVE AND SCIENTIFIC FARMING.

In order to support the present and future life of this Nation and make farming pay as it should, our farmers need to know more about the soils, orcharding, dairying, poultry raising, truck gardening, horticulture, bee culture, stock raising, stock breeding, rotation of crops, the testing of seeds, drainage, the chemical properties and value of fertilizers, and divers other things. I was reared on a farm and have at least a limited knowledge of the needs of the farmer. The demands upon our country for food products are such as to make more intensive and more progressive farming an absolute necessity.

For years the drift of our population has been from the country to the city. According to the United States census of 1880, 70.5 per cent of our people lived in the country, while 29.5 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1890 census showed that 63.9 per cent lived in the country while 36.1 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1900 census shows that 59.5 per cent lived in the country and 40.5 per cent lived in the cities and towns. The 1910 census shows that 53.7 per cent, or about 49,000,000, of our people are rural, while 46.3 per cent, or about 42,000,000, are urban or city.

In other words, we have just about as many people living in the cities and towns over 2,500 population as we do living in the country. By counting those who live in towns and villages under 2,500 in number we now have a greater urban than we have a rural population. The statistics I have cited show that people are constantly leaving the country and going to the cities and towns to live. Those who live in the cities, those who live in the mines, shops, and factories, and those who do not produce foods must be fed by those who do. In some sections of our country there is a good deal less land under cultivation today than there were 50 years ago. For example, the New England States had 72 per cent less land in cultivation in 1910 than they had in 1850. In certain agricultural sections, too, our rural population is decreasing. Iowa, the greatest agricultural State in the Union, 98 per cent of her land being capable of cultivation, has 4 per cent less population now than she had 10 years ago. In one-sixth of the total land area of the United States our population decreased during the years 1900 to 1910. In that decade our population decreased in 769 counties out of the 2,841 counties in the United States. The decrease covered an area of 472,462 square miles, 42,937 square miles of which were in the State of Missouri. The decrease in the State of Ohio amounted to 43.5 per cent. During the decade from 1900 to 1910 our urban population increased by 11,013,738, or 34.8 per cent; the total increase in our rural population was only 4,963,953, or 11.2 per cent. Our population is increasing at an enormous



rate, but that increase is in the cities and towns, not the country. In the past there has been too much drudgery in farm life. Its profits have been comparatively small, its inconveniences many. The tendency has been—and naturally so—for too many of our industrious, progressive, and enterprising young men and women to leave the farm and seek more profitable and sometimes more congenial employment in the cities and towns.

Farm life will have to be made as pleasant and profitable as that found elsewhere in order to attract to it the young men and women of to-day. There is a big temptation for far too many to seek the bright lights of the city. The United States has been blessed with an immense acreage of virgin soil. That condition no longer obtains. Unscientific agriculture can not be profitably carried on except on a virgin soil and under conditions which permit of extensive culture. It is therefore indispensable that our farming be more intensive, more scientific, and more profitable, if we are to sustain our ever-increasing population, which to-day exceeds 100,000,000. One of the scientific staff of our Federal Bureau of Soils recently made this statement:

If the possibilities of increased profit are not a sufficient inducement to undertake the training of our farmers, certainly in the immediate future the exigencies of the increasing population will force upon our public authorities the responsibility for making our agriculture adequate.

It is estimated by the Bureau of the Census, as well as by the Department of Agriculture, that "within the lifetime of children now entering our public schools the population of the United States will be no less than 450,000,000." We know this is not an extravagant prediction when we stop to realize that our population increased from a little over 7,000,000 in 1810 to over 91,000,000 in 1910.

It is the part of wisdom and statesmanship to look out for the future. Aside from conserving our human resources, the conservation of our natural resources, "of which the fertility of the soil is the most important," is our most important social duty. Our soil must be made to yield more each year without impairment. This can not be done with our present careless method of agriculture, nor can we continue our present method of agriculture without the food supply becoming relatively less from year to year.

The pressure of population upon our food resources will increase not merely for a few years but for all time to come. It will be constant and more insistent as the years go by. It is vitally essential that there be established in general practice a restorative and permanent system of soil culture. This agricultural education should not only reach the mature farmer of to-day through agriculture extension work and otherwise, but it is even more essential that the youths of our land be prepared and thoroughly instructed in the right theory and practice of farm work. This practice and training must not be merely State; it must be Nation wide in its scope. Our agriculture must be highly productive. It must be permanent. Science has taught other countries how to restore and maintain the fertility of their soil and increase its productivity. Germany, for example, has within the last 30 years increased her production of rye from 15 to 29 bushels per acre. Within the same period the United States increased her production of rye from only 14 to 16 bushels per acre. Germany increased her production of barley from 24 to 29 bushels per acre; the United States from 24 to 24.3. Germany increased her production of wheat from 19 to 30 bushels per acre; the United States from 13 to 15 bushels. Germany increased her production of oats from 31 to 59 bushels per acre; the United States from 28 to 30. Germany increased her production of potatoes from 115 to 208 bushels per acre; the United States from 98 to 100 bushels.

Senator PAGE, in a great speech before the Senate in July of last year, said:

Mr. President, Germany has an area equal only to the three States of Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri, but she produced three-fifths as much oats, four-fifths as much barley, three times as much sugar, six times as many potatoes, and nine times as much rye as we produced in the whole United States.

Germany had, in 1907, 43,000,000 acres sowed in wheat, barley, oats, and potatoes. She harvested 3,000,000,000 bushels. We had in the United States the same year 88,500,000 acres in the same crops and harvested only 1,875,000,000 bushels. Germany had less than half the acreage and harvested nearly double the same number of bushels. Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota are our three greatest wheat-producing States. France is about the same size as these three States. France sowed, in 1907, 16,000,000 acres in wheat. The States of Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota did the same. In that year France harvested from her 16,000,000 acres 325,000,000 bushels of wheat. Kansas, Minnesota, and North Dakota harvested from the same number of acres only 188,000,000 bushels. They have 45,000 agricultural

schools in France. France is the greatest producing nation in the world to-day. Germany, France, England, and some other countries produce from two to three times more of all sorts of products per acre than we do, and yet they have no better soil and no better climate. Science must do for us what it has done for these other countries. We have got to have better soil doctors in this country. We are compelled to give more attention to rotation of crops, fertilization, better seeds, and better breeds of stock. An expert in agricultural matters has recently said:

The nineteenth century farmer was no farmer at all; he was a miner, mining the fertility of the soil and selling it for the bare cost of mining.

He might have truthfully added that in too many cases the farmer does not raise anything to sell at all, but merely produces enough on which to live. I know that there are no better people than the ones I have the honor to represent.

I know that with our present methods of agriculture the problem of producing enough on which to live and laying a little something aside for a rainy day is a serious one. My district, too, has some 8,000 people engaged in mining. These people must be fed. The people living in the cities and towns must be fed. It would be infinitely better for all concerned if we could produce in our own district enough to support our own people.

In order to do this we will be compelled to make a study of our soil. We have got to find out whether it lacks in potash, phosphate, nitrogen, or other things, and then apply the remedy. We have got to quit putting the same piece of land in the same crop so often. We have got to find out what a certain piece of land is best adapted to produce and the best way in which to produce it.

Dr. Hopkins, of Illinois, one of the greatest soil chemists in America, was once lecturing down in the southern part of Illinois, near Egypt, where the land is poor. He explained to the farmers in that section how, by the application of \$1.50 worth of phosphate to the acre, the normal yield of corn would be increased from 12 to 13 bushels per acre to 50 or 60. At the conclusion of his lecture a gray-haired old farmer, with tears in his eyes, stepped up to him and said:

Mr. Hopkins, I want to thank you for what I have seen to-day, but, God help me, if I only knew that thing 40 years ago. I have got six boys in my family, and I have labored night and day to keep body and breeches together and to keep the family together, and what have I got on my farm? Twelve to fifteen and sixteen bushels of corn to the acre is all that I could make. Now, I would like to have sent my boys to college; I would like to have given those children an education; but I could not raise enough crops on that piece of land that I have owned, and so I have tilled all my lifetime and have earned barely enough to support my family. Now, if a man had only come to me when I was a comparatively young man and told me the thing that you have told me to-day—that \$1.50 of rock phosphate would have given me the 50 bushels of corn crop, the crop which was raised right over the fence from where I am—I could have sent my children to the high school and to a university, and—

He said, with tears running down his face—

I am at the end, and nobody told me that.

Too many good men have grown gray and worn their lives out as the old man in Illinois has done without knowing what to do to the soil to make it productive. This knowledge ought to be carried to them and their children. We have it already in the laboratories of our experiment stations and agricultural colleges. It is the purpose of the bill before us to help carry, especially to the children of these farmers, such knowledge as will make them practical and highly productive farmers. It will take years to solve the problem. The knowledge, I say, has in great measure already been obtained.

The men in charge of our agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and other institutions have for many years been giving the best efforts of their lives along these lines. The problem facing us is to carry the results of their experimentation and research into the homes of the people we represent and make it a part of the lives, especially "of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or who are preparing to enter upon the work of the farm or the farm home," as the bill expresses it. In each State this important work will be placed in the hands of a board of three or more persons, to be designated or created by the State legislature. Whether in Kentucky, for example, this State board will try to establish independent schools or classes for the purpose of imparting the valuable information of which I have been speaking, or whether they will try to do it largely through our public schools, I do not know. My own judgment is that the only effective way to reach the masses of our people, and especially the ones this bill is largely designed to reach and help, will be through our public schools. There is no other agency so powerfully effective in carrying this knowledge into the homes and into the lives of our farmers, actual and to be, as our public-school system, when its courses of study are vocationalized and made to respond to the actual needs and necessities of life. It is vitally essential that a restorative and permanent system of soil cul-



ture be established in general practice throughout our country, else the people will soon be in dire distress for the bare necessities of life.

Mr. Davenport has said:

The world has not yet learned to feed such a population as is just ahead of us, and before the present century is ended the largest single public issue will be that of bread.

We do not have to wait for the century to end, for bread, the high cost of living, the actual necessities of life to be the biggest public question for solution before our country to-day. It is the most vital question now before our people. It was so vital in 1912 that the Democratic Party in its platform adopted at Baltimore declared:

The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home. The Republican Party in its platform attempts to escape from responsibility for present conditions, by denying that they are due to a protective tariff. We take issue with them on that subject.

That was two years before the war in Europe began. Upon that, more than any other one issue, the Democrats won the Presidency. But for that issue, hopelessly divided though the Republicans were, the Democrats would not have won. The Democrats declared in their platform and on the stump that the high robber protective tariff that the Republicans had foisted upon the people was the cause of the high cost of living. They said they would reduce the tariff and bring down the cost of living, so that the poor man would always have enough money in his purse to purchase a decent meal. On that issue largely the Democrats came into power. They did reduce the tariff. On October 3, 1913, they did erase from the statute books of our country a Republican protective tariff law and in its stead placed a so-called free-trade tariff law of their own. The high cost of living, however, did not come down. It is higher to-day than it has ever been. At no time since the Democrats came into power, now nearly four years ago, has anyone been able to buy a single thing that men or women either eat, drink, or wear at less cost than when the Republicans were in power.

Upon the contrary, the average cost of the necessities of life are higher to-day by more than 25 per cent than they were when the Democratic Party came into power on March 4, 1913. As a matter of fact, the price of foodstuffs have been going up for years.

The following table shows the average retail price of food in the United States and the amount that could be bought for \$1 in each year from 1890 to November, 1916; sirloin steak excepted:

Year.	Articles.	Average retail price.	Amount bought for \$1.
			<i>Pounds.</i>
1907.....	Sirloin steak, per pound.....	\$.181	5.5
1916.....	.....do.....	.268	3.7
1890.....	Round steak, per pound.....	.123	8.1
1916.....	.....do.....	.239	4.2
1907.....	Rib roast, per pound.....	.150	6.7
1916.....	.....do.....	.210	4.8
1890.....	Fork chops, per pound.....	.107	9.3
1916.....	.....do.....	.228	4.4
1890.....	Bacon, smoked, per pound.....	.125	8.0
1916.....	.....do.....	.303	3.3
1890.....	Ham, smoked, per pound.....	.152	6.6
1916.....	.....do.....	.302	3.3
1890.....	Pure lard, per pound.....	.093	10.8
1916.....	.....do.....	.213	4.7
1890.....	Hens, per pound.....	.135	7.4
1916.....	.....do.....	.241	4.1
			<i>Dozen.</i>
1890.....	Eggs, per dozen.....	.208	4.8
1916.....	.....do.....	.506	2.0
			<i>Pounds.</i>
1890.....	Butter, pe: pound.....	.255	3.9
1916.....	.....do.....	.439	2.3
			<i>Quarts.</i>
1890.....	Fresh milk, per quart.....	.068	14.7
1916.....	.....do.....	.099	10.1
			<i>Bags.</i>
1890.....	Wheat flour, per bag.....	.711	1.41
1916.....	.....do.....	1.894	.72
			<i>Pounds.</i>
1890.....	Corn meal, per pound.....	.019	52.6
1916.....	.....do.....	.036	27.8
			<i>Pecks.</i>
1890.....	Irish potatoes, per peck.....	.247	4.0
1916.....	.....do.....	.511	2.0
			<i>Pounds.</i>
1890.....	Sugar, per pound.....	.069	14.5
1916.....	.....do.....	.085	11.6

The same thing is true of other foodstuffs. The same thing is true of clothing. The high cost of living is the most serious problem confronting us.

Never in the history of the world have taxes been so high or have visited us in so many of their obnoxious forms. The estimated deficit in the United States Treasury on June 30 next is \$300,000,000. The Democratic Members of Congress are now

racking their brains to find out how they can still further tax the people in order to meet this deficit. How many of our people can live under existing conditions is a problem. The people have again intrusted the Democratic Party with the task and duty of solving their problems and remedying their wrongs. It is up to the Democrats, not to us. It is not certain at all that we will even control the House of Representatives after March 4. Democratic statesmen and near statesmen are now coming forth with this nostrum and that as the sure cure for the high cost of living, but among all the panaceas proposed no one of them charges that the high cost of living is due to a high protective tariff or that a free-trade tariff will bring it down. A food embargo, among other things, is proposed. After all is said and done, and after these remedies are tried out, if they are, it will doubtless be discovered that the high cost of living will still continue, and that the surest way to bring permanent relief is through more extensive, intensive, and scientific agriculture. The farmer is not now getting any more for his products than he ought to get. The consumer, though, pays twice as much for the farmer's products as the farmer sells them for. The price is raised by the middlemen, the commission merchants, the great cold-storage concerns, food trusts, and others after it leaves the farmer's hands on its way to the table of the ultimate consumer. Laws already on the statute books are probably ample to protect the people if they are vigorously and fearlessly enforced. This would help reduce the high cost of living. Those criminals who for the sake of paltry gain are cornering the food supply of the country and holding it from the mouths of hungry men and the stomachs of starving children, should be prosecuted to the limit of the law. Taxing these cold-storage concerns and others for holding foods longer than a certain period of time would help; but let me repeat that after all is said and done the fact will be found to still remain that we have got to have a greater production to meet the ever-increasing demand for foodstuffs. If we fail in this, prices will still remain distressingly high.

#### HOME ECONOMICS.

Home economics is the science of home making. It includes a knowledge of ventilation, cooking, hygiene, household sanitation, preparation of foods for the sick, care of children, motherhood, food values, what foods constitute a well-balanced meal, what foods are compatible and what are incompatible, and many other things of immense practical value. It is not the purpose of this bill to make provision for the farmer's boy and leave the farmer's girl and the farmer's wife to look out for themselves. It is not the purpose of this bill to make provision for the practical instruction of the miner's son and leave the miner's wife and daughter unaided in these things that are so essential to the welfare and well-being of the family. It is in the home where the chief happiness of mankind is found. All must eat some sort of food; all must live in some sort of a home. It is there where character is formed and the principles of good conduct and good citizenship instilled. It is a trite old saying that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Good home makers—good mothers are the greatest asset any nation can have. The foundation of all good government is laid in the home. And since every girl is a potential mother and mistress of a home it is just as essential that she be educated along practical and useful lines as it is that her brothers be. So this bill provides that the Federal Government shall not only aid the States in paying the salaries of teachers to teach home-economic subjects but shall also aid the States in paying the salaries of teachers to train other teachers to teach these subjects. Home-economic subjects ought to be a part of the curriculum in all our public schools and their teaching made compulsory. Statistics show that 5,000,000 people in this country become ill every year from preventable diseases and 600,000 infants under 2 years of age terminate their little span of life, most of them from a lack of proper care. The young women of to-day are the home makers of to-morrow. They should be fitted and trained for their important tasks. This training should reach down to the average girl who goes to neither high school nor to college, but who one of these days will have the care of a home and a family.

#### COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES.

The acquiring of a commercial education is now pretty well provided throughout the country, and, while this bill makes provision for Federal aid to such education, I shall not now take time to discuss it. The feature to which I want to call your special attention is that provision of the bill which seeks to promote the welfare of the boy and girl whose parents are engaged in the industries—whose parents, and especially whose fathers, are every-day laborers. Whether they be blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, machinists, plumbers, barbers, engineers, miners, or otherwise engaged in manual labor, it matters not.



This bill is designed to reach those who are not able to send their sons and daughters to college or the university; those who need the labor of their offspring to help support the family. We are all laborers. Some work more with their heads than they do with their hands, and some work more with their hands than they do with their heads. One is just as honorable as the other. The farmer longs for the so-called leisure of the lawyer's office. The overtaxed lawyer and public servant longs for the health-giving freedom of the farm. This bill is designed to help fit for useful employment the boys and girls who can not go through high school or college but who must go to work to help support themselves and the family. And, as I have said, there are less than 2 out of every 100 of our American boys and girls who ever reach the college or university, and 9 out of every 10 never even pass from the elementary grade to the high school or academy. This bill is designed to reach and benefit that great army of our boys and girls who never reach high school, college, or academy. The purpose of this bill is to help fit for useful employment in some trade or industry this great and ever-increasing army of American youths.

The Federal Government proposes to pay \$3,000,000 annually in cooperation with the States toward the payment of salaries of teachers to teach trade, home economics, and industrial subjects, and in addition to that, \$1,000,000 annually toward the payment of salaries of teachers to train teachers to teach these and agricultural subjects. All these teachers should have had actual experience in the trade or subject they undertake to teach. In the language of the bill the controlling purpose of such education shall be to "fit for useful employment" and "shall be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who are preparing for a trade or industrial pursuit or who have entered upon the work of a trade or industrial pursuit."

There are to be three kinds of schools established—all day, part time, and evening. In the all-day schools the instruction is to be given for at least nine months out of the year to persons over 14 years of age who have not entered upon employment. The instruction for "at least half of the time" shall "be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis." The part-time schools are designed to aid workers over 14 years of age "who have entered upon employment." The evening schools are designed to aid workers over 16 years of age. The instruction to be given is to be "supplemental to the daily employment." One, if not the controlling, reason why so many children leave school at such an early age is that neither they nor their parents can see any practical benefits growing out of such education. They fail to see, and they are not alone in that, how the study of algebra, higher arithmetic, Latin, or Greek is going to aid them very materially in knowing how to feed the cow, bake the beans, or break the horse, or how to plant and till the corn or mine and load the coal, or how to paint the house or dig the ditch. It is a great sacrifice on the part of many parents not to put their children over 14 years of age into the ranks of the breadwinners.

In the great majority of cases the only way to induce the child or its parents to continue the child's education after the age of 14 is to show, at least the parents, that what the child is to learn in school will enable it to command a better wage, fit it to do something really useful, and enable it to solve life's greatest problem—the bread-and-butter one. It is essential, not only to the child but to the country of which he is an important part, that he be trained and taught in useful employment and made to know that it is just as honorable to work with the hands as it is with the head. The minds of the laboring man's children are as acute, their perceptions as keen, as those of any other class. The laboring man himself, the man who works with his hands, should hold up his head in any company and feel, what he has a got a right to feel, that he is just as honorable as any man in it.

#### CONCLUSION.

I am for this bill because it is designed to help develop and conserve both our natural and human resources. I am for it because it will help to promote a productive and prosperous agriculture. I am for it because it will help to increase the wage-earning power of our productive workers and greatly enhance the price of the output. It will help both employer and employee. It will greatly increase our wealth. The distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. HUGHES, recently said in a speech:

If we assume that a system of vocational education pursued through years of the past would have increased the wage-earning capacity of each of these 25,000,000 workers to the extent of 10 cents a day, this would have made an increase of wages for the group \$2,500,000 a day, or \$750,000,000 a year, with all that this would mean to the wealth and life of the Nation. This is a very moderate estimate, and the facts would probably show a difference between the earning power of the vocationally trained and the vocationally untrained of 25 cents a day.

This would indicate a waste of wages through lack of training amounting to \$6,250,000 every day, or \$1,875,000,000 for the year. That is difficult for us to conceive and believe, but these figures are true.

The money expended for vocational education is a wise business investment. The practical training of men in any pursuit brings lasting economic returns in increased production and wage-earning power.

Miss O'Reilly, in her statement before the committee, said:

The nation of the future which will hold the industrial supremacy of the world will be the nation which makes the things best for the markets of the world. That can only be done through the scientific organization of industry; that scientific organization of industry can only come through the training of the workers.

Miss O'Reilly is undoubtedly right in what she says.

American agriculture has prospered in the past because we have the richest soil in the world. Our people have treated it as though it were inexhaustible and as though its fertility would last forever. We know better now. To conserve our soil and feed the increasing population every farmer must be an expert.

Our American manufacturers have prospered in the past, first, because our raw materials have both been cheap and abundant; second, because of the abundance of poorly paid foreign labor that has been admitted to our shores; third, because of the executive and inventive genius of our people; and fourth, because of our production on a large scale. All these conditions can not always prevail. All of them do not prevail now. We have been selling too much raw material and not enough finished products. We ought to "sell more brains and less material." While the United States in volume of output leads the four other great manufacturing nations of the world, still our exports consist largely of "crude materials." As a matter of fact, less than one-third of the volume of our foreign commerce consists of manufactures ready for consumption. We have exploited the soil beneath our feet. We have slain the forest and robbed the hills, and in our national anthem still continue to sing that we "love" them.

The maintenance and development of our foreign trade will, as the years roll by, depend more and more upon our ability to compete with foreign nations in the products of skilled labor.

The vocationally trained artisans of England, France, and Germany excel our own in skill and efficiency. If the future battles of nations are largely to be fought in the markets of the world, as many see it; if the victory is to depend largely upon the skill and efficiency of our workers; if there is now scarcely an untrained man in all of Germany; if the workers in still other countries are better trained than in our own; if there is to be added yearly 1,000,000 untrained workers to our already 25,000,000, not 2 per cent of whom have been adequately trained for their work, then it does not take a prophet to foresee the results of the contest.

We need national aid to vocational education, because the question is a national one in its scope and because the States are unable to properly handle it. In only nine States has the work by the State as such been undertaken, and not even 1 per cent of the workers who need training have been reached.

We need national aid to vocational education because the National Government ought to introduce into our educational system, since the States have not, the needed elements to make it purposeful and useful. The Federal Government ought to stand for the principle that the aim of utility in education is just as important as the aim of culture, and is entitled to take its place in dignity by the side of it. This will do more than any other one thing to bring about a reform in our public-school system and cause the courses of study to be planned to fit the student for the practical and the useful.

It is not the purpose of this bill to take away from the State either their power or responsibility in educational matters. It is rather to stimulate and encourage them into right action along educational lines.

Its purpose is to put a practical training in the reach of the 92 per cent of our children who leave school before they ever complete a high-school grade. Its purpose is to reach out a helping hand to the poor man's son and the poor man's daughter.

I do not want to be understood as predicting that the bill before us, when enacted into law, will work any immediate revolution in our public-school system or in the lives of those now in being. It will take time for even a semblance of its influence to be seen, at least in some parts of our country. Nobody assumes that this bill has reached a solution of this great problem. Time and experience will change and modify the provisions in this bill and add to them many important features that in our ignorance, inexperience, and shortsightedness we have omitted. The future historian of our country, however, will vindicate the position of those who have sponsored and



voted for this measure. The country will be indebted to them for having inaugurated a movement that will be, at least, in years to come, of far-reaching effect in determining the standing and prestige of our Nation and the usefulness of its citizenship. I am glad that the House saw fit to adopt my amendment which provided that the members of the Federal board shall be practical men and be selected from the various interests to be affected.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, this section is the controverted section. It was discussed at length before the committee not only for weeks but for months. We thought that the wording of that section as presented by the committee was simple, and allowed the board to be appointed by the President and gave him full power to appoint the board, but after consultation I think that I can say that on behalf of the committee we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Education, is somewhat in error in the statement that the committee is unanimously in favor of accepting the proposed amendment.

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I discussed it with him a few minutes ago, and I understood that he agreed to it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. When my friend spoke to me about the matter, I understood him to refer to another amendment—an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. I regret sincerely that there should have been any misunderstanding.

I prefer to let section 6 stand as it is written, but since the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] has offered an important amendment, which seems to be favored by a majority of the committee, I shall at the proper time offer a substitute for the entire section, and I ask that I be permitted now to submit my proposed substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The section has not yet been perfected, and, as the gentleman's amendment is in the nature of a substitute, it would not be in order until the section is perfected.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Then, I desire to have my substitute read at this time for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the substitute will be read at this time for information.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Amend the bill by striking out all of section 6 and substituting the following:

"Sec. 6. That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby created an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of education, which shall be under the supervision of a secretary of education, who shall be appointed by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum, and whose term of office shall be the same as that of the heads of the other executive departments. The said secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for said department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

"There shall be in said department an assistant secretary of education, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$6,000 a year, and who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the secretary or required by law. There shall also be such clerical assistants as may be authorized by Congress.

"The department of education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act, and it shall be the duty of said department to make or cause to have made studies, investigations, and reports with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUGHES. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the comma after the word "workers," on page 9, line 11; also, in line 14, after the word "pursuits"; also, in line 15, after the word "workers"; also, in line 17, after the word "principles." All of those commas should be changed to semicolons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 11, after the word "workers," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; same page, line 14, after the word "pursuits," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; same page, line 15, after the word "workers," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon; and in line 17, after the word "principles," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, after line 11, add the following:

"Said board may from time to time appoint advisory committees made up of persons representing industries, commerce, labor, agriculture, home making, or general or vocational education, to assist them by advice in the administration of this act, and may fix the compensation of such advisory committee, but not more than \$50,000 shall be expended by the board for this purpose."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has just been adopted, proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], providing for a representative board, was one of the amendments that I stated in general debate upon the Indian bill I would offer. Another amendment that I stated at that time I would offer is the amendment that is now pending, providing that this vocational board may appoint from time to time advisory committees, with a limitation upon the expenditures that it may make of \$50,000 per year. Now, Mr. Chairman, upon this section 6, in many respects the most important in this bill, two great bodies have given it great consideration and have united in their conclusions upon it—the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Federation of Labor. Both of those bodies, usually more or less antagonistic to each other, urged the adoption of this amendment that is now pending. The United States Chamber of Commerce in a pamphlet, which no doubt all Members have received, in digesting the House and Senate bills, have this to say concerning this proposition:

The change asked by the national chamber's committee is that the Federal board should be required to appoint advisory committees of five each, representing industry, commerce, labor, agriculture, home-making, and general or vocational education. Each committee should be appointed only for such a time as the Federal board determines, and the members should receive for the time of their actual service both compensation and their traveling expenses. The members of each committee should be chosen to represent as many different parts of the country as the geographical distribution of the industry being studied will permit.

That is the attitude of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Now, in reference to the attitude of the American Federation of Labor, I read from the report of the executive council made to the last annual convention of the federation, as follows:

It is our opinion that this new board should be composed of representative men but not partisan representatives of the administration in power. Its personnel should represent the great fundamental activities of life, namely, agriculture, labor, commerce, industry, and education, and the local advisory boards should be equally representative, so that the human activities of the Republic could feel assured that experienced, tested men from their own vocations, such as labor, commerce, agriculture, industry, and education should be fairly and efficiently represented.

That, Mr. Chairman, expresses the views of these two great bodies that are primarily interested in this great subject, the employer of labor and the labor employees themselves.

Now, I am anxious to expedite the consideration of this bill, and I shall not take the time to go into the reasons for these advisory committees as I would under other circumstances, but it can all be summed up in the proposition that this bill should be perfected to the greatest extent possible, so as to insure practical vocational education to the youth of our land, and that means that practical standards should be adopted by this board, composed of practical men, and in so far as they need advice they should have it from practical men. As the bill now stands, Mr. Chairman, it is made mandatory upon this vocational board to get their information through the various departments, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments, and that means that this bill—with all due respect to the committee, and I do respect it most highly—in its operation, although that was not the intent of the committee, would make the administration of this bill based upon theory rather than upon practical knowledge.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt the gentleman just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and refer him to lines 17 to 19, page 10 of the bill, where this language occurs:

The Federal board for vocational education shall have the power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Would not that give them the right kind?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, that is the phraseology that we always use in bills contemplating permanent employees or officials. It does not contemplate this kind of a board at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.



Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, we need the practical men in order to get these uniform standards, in order that they shall be standards that will not merely make an avenue to drain the money from the Federal Treasury to the States for the purpose of paying it over to them upon some theoretical system of education, but in order to make every dollar that goes out of the State treasury mean something of value to the boys and girls of the land; and if that is to be done we need practical advice, instead of compelling this board to get their information through college graduates, specialists if you please, and trained people if you please. After all, in the performance of this great work there is no graduate in economics, there is no professor of economics anywhere in the United States that can give the effective advice required for the making of these standards, the practical standards that we would have by actual advice of men who know what they are talking about because they have lived in their trade or business and have been brought up in it. I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. TOWNER rose.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the bill carries, and I think I understand the amendment that has been agreed to by the House. But if I understand this present amendment, it proposes to create boards, at an expense of \$50,000 a year, not exceeding \$50,000 a year. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; coming out of the \$200,000 already provided for.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; coming out of the \$200,000. That is the whole amount provided for?

Mr. LENROOT. For the administration of the board.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. Now, the amendment, if we must have a board, provides for the appointment by the President, to be confirmed by the Senate, of a board of five. That other provision cares for all this appropriation to be cared for, not by a board of several or by several boards but at a total expense of \$20,000. This is a proposition to make an additional expense at least of \$30,000. It may be \$130,000, as the case may be. The only limit is the \$200,000, as I understand it. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman means the expense of these advisory committees, that is \$50,000.

Mr. CANNON. Then this is an increase of \$30,000. It is \$50,000 for the advisory committees that the gentleman's amendment covers. Is that right?

Mr. LENROOT. A limit of \$50,000.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; a limit of \$50,000. Now, I have listened and have gained my knowledge of this bill not by prior investigation but as the debate has proceeded and from reading the bill and report. I apprehend that it is going to pass. Perhaps it ought to pass. I may get into a condition where I will vote for it [laughter], if I keep on learning, before the final vote comes.

But we have been urged to pass this bill. What for? To encourage the States. That is it; not to take possession. It is a donation from Uncle Sam for the education of the people, to encourage the States to participate. How are they to participate? They are to participate through the State boards. Well, I suppose those State boards ought to know what they want. I presume they will know what they want, with the approval now of the Federal board that is provided for by the amendment that is agreed to.

Great Heavens! It looks to me more and more as if this is a proposition to create unnecessary offices, and God knows if there is a government in the world that has now so many unnecessary offices, multiplied and multiplied, and a disposition to multiply further, and with a notice now to make a Cabinet officer out of the head of the Bureau of Education, which is to be offered in an amendment later. Let us give something to the States, to encourage the States, and if they do not select boards that are skilled, then the whole thing fails, because they must cooperate if they get a part of this fund.

Maybe I have grown old; maybe I am not practical. But with the amazing amount of legislation that we have had for the last decade, some of it under us God-blessed Republicans [laughter], saints, as I call them [laughter]—but you have "seen us" and "raised the limit" [laughter]—do you not

think you had better take an account of stock for a little while? Let us be practical. Let us have something out of all this legislation to go to the children, for whose betterment we are trying to legislate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Lenroot amendment, for the reason that I think it will make this bill more practical. I believe the amendment just adopted, proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], has made this bill more practical and I am heartily in favor of it. When we consider that an army of a million of young people of school age finish their education each year before they are 15 years of age, before completing the eighth grade, we must come to the conclusion that this measure is the most important measure that we have considered, not only at this session but the most important measure that has been considered for many sessions of Congress. It is the greatest conservation movement before the people—the conservation of the efficiency of the industrial workers.

In Wisconsin we have had some experience with vocational education. We passed a law in 1911, and while it contained a board like the one proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, we did not have these advisory committees, and we did not administer the law in a practical way. The educators on the board administered the law, and not the practical men on the board. But in the last two years we have had advisory committees similar to the one proposed in the Lenroot amendment, and we have accomplished more in the last two years in making vocational education practical than we did in the several years before. The Wisconsin Board of Industrial Education is composed of three employers of labor, three skilled employees, the State superintendent of public instruction, the dean of the College of Engineering, and the dean of the extension department of the University of Wisconsin. This board is well balanced, very efficient, and is doing a wonderful work.

We went through the motions of vocational education for several years before. Our young men who were studying manual training and vocational training spent their time making boot-jacks and birch-bark bird houses and coat hangers, but did not get down to the real, practical work of vocational education.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If Wisconsin has done so admirably upon her own motion, can not the other States, under this law that we propose to pass, be trusted to be as wise as Wisconsin through their various boards, providing one-half of the amount from their State treasuries? Oh, we have got some wisdom in the other States. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWNE. I think the other States can be trusted, but if we can hurry this matter up it is important to do so. Every year there are a million young people going out of school before finishing the eighth grade, with no education that will help them to make a living, and if we can hurry up their training a few years we shall be doing a great service to them and the entire country, and really making more advancement in conservation than by any of these other conservation movements. It will simply get us along quicker if the Government gives some aid, as it is giving aid in all these other activities. Now, this amendment is simply the adoption of the German system. About 30 years ago Bismarck said to his educators that the education system of Germany was not practical enough, and he practically took the vocational education or industrial education of Germany out of the hands of the schoolmasters and placed it in the hands of practical men and created boards composed of employers of labor and skilled laborers, and as a result of that practical education we have the great efficiency of the German people to-day. There are practically no able-bodied people in Germany who are not self-supporting. She sets an example for the world in this respect.

The city of Munich probably has greater efficiency in its industrial workers than any other city in the world, due to its board of vocational education which is composed of 23 representatives of local occupations, and Dr. Kirchen Steiner, its superintendent, says of his advisory board:

I could not have gotten along in any other way. The personnel of my board causes each local occupation, 50 in all, to be taught with a particularity and an intensiveness that make the city lead in its industries in all the markets of the world.

Munich has an advisory board of some 20 members who are conversant with all the different industries taught, of which there are about 50. Now, as I say, we can not make this bill too practical. We have made it practical in one way by the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS], and I believe we will make it still more practical by adopt-



ing the amendment of my colleague [Mr. LENROOT]. The great weakness of industrial education in the different States to-day is that it does not give a practical education that will enable a boy to be proficient enough in his trade to earn a good living. The great fault in many of our law schools to-day is that we have theoretical lawyers, law professors who have never appeared in court and never tried a case, who are teaching law; while the law schools that have practical men, who are in active practice and who come to the lecture room from the courts, are the ones that are turning out young men who are practical and efficient lawyers, and I believe we should proceed in this way in vocational education, along practical lines, by having a representative board and giving them the opportunity offered by this amendment to consult with practical and experienced men from all the various industries.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The provision of the amendment is that there shall be five advisory boards appointed by the Federal board.

Mr. LENROOT. The number is not limited.

Mr. TOWNER. The number is not limited. There may be more than that. I accepted the statement that was submitted to the United States Chamber of Commerce. These boards shall consist of five or more members. These gentlemen are to have \$50,000 appropriated among themselves each year for the purpose of enabling them to advise the central board here in Washington regarding the performance of its duties. I was very much amused with the suggestion of my friend from Wisconsin that these advisory boards, that are to come here from all over the United States to tell the commission how to perform their duties, are a practical institution. I imagine them coming here from all over the country to advise the commission in a practical way about how to perform the duties of their office.

I thought the President ought to have a free hand in the appointment of the commission. I yielded in my judgment to the limitation that has been placed upon the President in the appointment of the commission. I have done this against my judgment, but for the purpose of securing a speedy conclusion of the consideration of this bill. But when it comes to taking \$50,000 out of the \$200,000 fund for the purpose of making a holiday excursion for men from California and Colorado and all over the United States to come here and advise this general board how to perform its duties, it seems to me that the proposition is nothing else than ridiculous. The provision of the bill is—

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning agriculture, for the purposes of agricultural education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Agriculture.

I wonder if my friend from Wisconsin considers that the work of the Department of Agriculture is merely theoretical? Yet this work is to be done in conjunction with the Agricultural Department of the Government, so as to save this additional expense and make the work of the commission more effective. The bill says that—

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries, for the purposes of trade and industrial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor.

I wonder if my friend thinks that the Secretary of Labor is a purely theoretical man, and that those who are associated with him would give the board merely theoretical advice? And so on with regard to the other departments.

This bill is framed on the idea that there shall be cooperation with these various departments named in the bill, and that the various specialists shall aid in advising and assisting the commission in the conduct of its work. I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be voted down, because I believe it will be a useless and a needless expenditure of \$50,000 of money that could be better applied for the practical work of the board.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has built up a man of straw and then has proceeded to demolish it. The gentleman says that we propose to throw away \$50,000 in furnishing junketing trips for the members of this committee. The gentleman from Iowa knows that in the language of the bill as it now stands, and which he approves of, it appropriates any sum up to \$200,000 for the purpose of making this very study and investigation. The difference between my amendment and his proposition is that I want some practical knowledge brought through these studies and investigations and he does not care whether there is any practical knowledge or not.

The gentleman talks about the Department of Agriculture. I frankly admit that these studies can be made through the

Department of Agriculture, because their experts are made up to-day of efficient, practical men, as a rule. But when he comes to the other departments, when he speaks of the Department of Labor he furnishes no argument when he says that the Secretary of Labor is a competent man. He is, but Secretary of Labor Wilson is not going to make these studies and investigations. The Department of Labor is a splendid bureau through which to get information and statistics, but it is valueless, practically speaking, so far as furnishing this board with information concerning the one great question of making uniform standards for vocational education.

The gentleman talks as if my amendment was mandatory. It is discretionary with this board whether they call upon these men or not, and if this board desires the views and experience of practical men in fixing these standards, will anyone say why the board should not have the authority to call upon practical men to furnish it? They are not required to call upon them, they are not required to appoint a single committee unless they choose to do it, but my amendment gives them the right to do it. Mr. Chairman, I insist that if this bill is to be something more than a drainage tube from the Federal Treasury to the State treasury, that we ought to adopt every safeguard possible, and this amendment furnishes one of the safeguards.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be very much better to call men in who have practical information to convey to the board than it would be for the board to hold hearings in order to obtain the information or facts that practical men might have?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; very much better for this board to meet men face to face and get its information from them than to get it from specialists from some bureau second hand.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, just one minute. Lines 17, 18, and 19 of this section gives the power to the Federal board that this amendment proposes to give.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman read it?

Mr. FESS (reading)—

It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules, regulations, and decisions which the board may adopt. The Federal board for vocational education shall have power to employ such assistants as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman—who is familiar with the phraseology used in legislative acts—whether he thinks for one moment that the word “assistants” in that section contemplates anything of this kind?

Mr. FESS. That is the way it is written.

Mr. LENROOT. Then it differs from all other bills that we have had.

Mr. FESS. The purpose of this provision is to link up the Federal board with the Government agencies and to get through these special organizations now already created what is needed without creating a separate organization with increased expenditure.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Ohio think that the language he has just read authorizes the Federal board to employ clerks, and nothing else?

Mr. FESS. It authorizes the board to employ anyone without limit of salary that it sees fit to make the investigation and to make the board effective. We state that this investigation shall be made as far as possible in matters of labor through the Labor Department, and in matters of commerce through the Commerce Department, and in matters of agriculture through the Agricultural Department, and our purpose is not to create a separate commission with increased salaries—a thing we are all tired of—but to get this work done by experts in departments already created. There is no place in the world where we have as many investigators, such a group of scholars, such a group of practical men as we have in the various executive departments now under control of the President of the United States, and we do not want needlessly to create a special commission to do this work, but we wish to do it through already created boards under the jurisdiction of our cabinet officers. This was the purpose of omitting this special advisory board, and it seems to me unwise to create a new commission with an additional expense. The amendment providing for representation of the various fields which we just adopted insures against impractical methods.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the language of the bill permitted the very thing that my amendment proposes, and then at the conclusion of his argument he says that that is not the intention. What is the gentleman's view of it?



Mr. FESS. The gentleman's view of the matter is that the Federal board can make the investigation that it thinks is necessary to make it effective, to make the bill practicable through all the existing departments here instead of creating a separate commission to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] be to create a number of new place holders and supernumeraries, who would be simply in addition to the officers already created by us?

Mr. FESS. That is one reason I am objecting to it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is the most important feature of the bill and that it ought to be adopted. The language read by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], contained on lines 17, 18, 19, of page 10, if it does anything, authorizes the board which the bill creates to employ a permanent staff of investigators who will be on the pay roll for all time, whereas the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] proposes to authorize the appointment of an advisory board or boards of practical men in their various lines. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says that the bill proposes to make the investigations through the Agricultural Department, through the Department of Labor, and through the Department of Commerce, and I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio what the Department of Labor knows about the various trades of the United States, or what the Department of Commerce knows about the various activities in the commerce of the United States, excepting in so far as they are able to compile a lot of statistics in connection with the movement of commodities. If you want to get information about the activities of the commerce of the United States and of the practical things in connection with the movements of men engaged in commerce, you want to talk to the men who are engaged in the industries of the United States. If you want to get the practical information about the trades of the United States, you must talk to the men who are in the trades of the United States, and not to the Department of Labor, whose offices are filled with a lot of politicians who know nothing about trades.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asks why you would go to the Department of Agriculture to find information pertaining to agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, let the gentleman talk about the other things. I have not criticized that part of it.

Mr. FESS. I think I would go to the Department of Agriculture because I would find a group of people there who probably know more about the science of agriculture than any other group that probably could be found anywhere.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend does not do me justice. He does not state what I stated. I said you provided in this bill that you should. I did not say that you ought not to go. What I say is that you ought not to go to the Department of Labor or to the Department of Commerce, because neither of these departments knows anything about the practical side of the things with which they deal.

Mr. CANNON. Then they ought to be abolished.

Mr. MADDEN. They do not treat of the practical side of the life of the country. They are compiling statistics; they are making records of things done by people who have practical knowledge; and if you want to get practical knowledge, you must go to the man who has it. It is not in the possession of any man in either of these departments, for he is not working at his trade, and most of the men in the departments have no trade and have no knowledge of trades.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is this Federal board of vocational education, consisting of the United States Commissioner of Education and four members appointed by the President of the United States, to do?

Mr. MADDEN. They are to regulate the conduct of the education which is provided for in the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that the President will appoint five men competent to do this work?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no knowledge of what the President will do. Judging from what he has done in the past, I would rather doubt it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think we ought to appoint an advisory board for the Interstate Commerce Commission to tell it what to do?

Mr. MADDEN. We have already provided for the appointment of an advisory board for a more important board than the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Federal Reserve Bank Board is being advised by men of intelligence, men of practical experience.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If we create these Federal boards and then create advisory boards to wet-nurse them, why do not we create the United States Chamber of Commerce on one side and the American Federation of Labor on the other to wet-nurse the Congress of the United States and tell it what to do?

Mr. MADDEN. We are only providing that the appointments shall be made, and any provision for appointments that may be made ought to be on practical lines, and that is suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 27, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 12, after the word "education," add the following: "or any member thereof."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] for just a moment. This amendment that I have offered is for the purpose of perfecting the section in accordance with the amendment of mine which was adopted a little while ago. The bill provides that the Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable. That was upon the theory that he was to be the chairman of the board. My amendment, which was adopted a while ago, provides that this chairman shall be annually elected by the members of the board, and so I have added, after the word "education," the words "or any member thereof" may make these recommendations to the board. That is the gist of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 16, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Page 10, line 15, strike out the words "Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "chairman of the board."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment, offered for the purpose of perfecting the bill as amended. The original bill provides it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Education to carry out the rules and regulations and decisions which the board may adopt. That was under the theory that the Commissioner of Education was going to be the chairman of the board, and that has been changed. He may be the chairman and he may not be the chairman. Therefore I move to strike out the words "Commissioner of Education" and say "the chairman of the board."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I sincerely hope the committee will accept the amendment, since the amendment has been adopted providing the board shall elect its own chairman. The duty of carrying out the regulations should devolve upon the chairman and not upon the Commissioner of Education, who now merely becomes a member ex officio of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me in view of the amendment that has been adopted that we should strike out of the bill, beginning at line 12, down to the word "adopt" in line 17, for the reason that the Commissioner of Education is now a member of this board and acts with the board at all times.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. And this provision which is made with the view that the Commissioner of Education should be chairman of the board is now unnecessary, and this part of the bill should be stricken out.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly.



Mr. BORLAND. It strikes me that the provision there that the Commissioner of Education should make recommendation to the board is not based solely on the fact that he is chairman of the board, or based on the fact that he is an officer of the Government. It is presumed that he has the same policy in regard to education that is common to the other members of the board. His investigation as an expert educator should be useful to the board. On no other theory would he make any recommendation at all. The board meets in order to make their own recommendation.

Mr. DOWELL. In answer to the gentleman I merely desire to say that the Commissioner of Education under the amendment is now one of the commissioners. He is present and acts with this commission and is a part of it. He may submit at any time any suggestions or recommendations he desires, the same as any other commissioner. Why should we give one commissioner a certain right to recommend that we do not give to all, when they now stand upon an equal footing? It seems to me that these lines should be stricken out, and when it is in order I desire to make the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I send an amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 17, strike out section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The administration of this act shall be under the control of the Commissioner of Education."

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield? I have one or two amendments to offer in order to perfect the section. If I do not waive the right, I have no objection to his going on.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Missouri will allow, there has been read prior to this time an amendment by way of substitute to the entire section, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and until the section is perfected the Chair would hold that the gentleman's amendment is not now in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I think the Chair is right about that, and I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 21, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I make the same amendment on line 1, page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 1, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. And the same amendment, Mr. Chairman, in line 5, page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 5, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. And on line 9 strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 9, strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not, in view of the fact that

the Commissioner of Education is no longer chairman of the board, lines 14, 15, and 16 should not come out on page 10.

Mr. HUGHES. It has been amended to cover that part.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment by way of substitute—

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which in view of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. POWERS) should now be offered, inasmuch as the language has been changed. I move to strike out lines 12, 13, and 14 to the period.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWELL. Page 10, lines 12, 13, and 14, strike out the following language:

"The Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the board relative to the administration of this act as he may from time to time deem advisable."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. Was that amendment not voted on a few moments ago?

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment was not voted upon. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. DOWELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 21, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment, by way of substitute for the entire section, offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read the whole substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment by way of substitute will again be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERCROMBIE: Amend the bill by striking out all of section 6 and substituting the following:

"SEC. 6. That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, there is hereby created an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of education, which shall be under the supervision of a secretary of education, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum, and whose term of office shall be the same as that of the heads of the other executive departments. The said secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for said department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

"There shall be in said department an assistant secretary of education, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$8,000 a year, and who shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the secretary or required by law. There shall also be such clerical assistants as may be authorized by Congress.

"The department of education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the provisions of this act, and it shall be the duty of said department to make, or cause to have made, studies, investigations, and reports, with particular reference to their use in aiding the States in the establishment of vocational schools and classes and in giving instruction in agriculture, trades and industries, commerce and commercial pursuits, and home economics."

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order, and the gentleman from Tennessee reserves it. But the gentleman from Illinois makes it. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. It clearly is not germane to the bill. It creates an executive department of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear from the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the gentleman from Illinois is a universally recognized authority in the matter of the interpretation and application of the rules of this House. In fact, I have never known his superior as a parliamentarian. I submit, however, that the proposed substitute seems to be germane. Section 6 provides an agency for carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and the substitute which I offer for section 6 provides an agency for carrying into effect the provisions of this act. Their purposes are the same; their duties the same.

Section 6 as originally drawn created a board, to be composed of five Cabinet officers and the Commissioner of Education. Section 6 as reported by the Committee on Education creates a similar board, to be composed of the Commissioner of Educa-



tion as ex-officio chairman and four members to be appointed by the President. The substitute which I offer creates an agency for a similar purpose. Instead of creating a board it establishes a department and charges it with the duty of administering the provisions of this act. The proposed substitute confers upon the proposed department no power, no duty, that is not directly connected with the purposes and provisions of this act and that is not conferred upon the proposed board.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the proposed amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The proposed amendment, a substitute, is not germane to the bill under consideration.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BORLAND: Page 8, line 17, strike out section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The administration of this act shall be under the control of the Commissioner of Education."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should be adopted it would, of course, necessitate unanimous consent or subsequent amendment to change the other portions of the bill. It seems to me that there is no magic in the word "board." In fact, we may sometimes attribute to a board virtues that it really does not possess.

The first bill passed by Congress providing for cooperation with the States in an activity which was formerly considered to be entirely within the State's jurisdiction was the road bill. The road bill, I think, furnished the model for this bill. But in the road bill, in order to get it passed and approved by the people and their Representatives, it was provided that as much of the money as possible should go directly to the object to be accomplished, namely, the construction of roads. Care was taken that an undue amount of the money should not be absorbed in the creation of salaried positions. It seems that that reasoning is just as cogent in this matter as it was in the case of the road bill. In other words, it seems that what we want to do is to stimulate education and provide as much of the Federal activities in that direction as possible and to spend as little as we can on the machinery of the administration.

Now, I say that is what we want to do. I take it that that is what the House wants to do. I would not want to assume that the House wants to create unnecessary offices. But if we did not find it necessary in administering the great road fund—more than twice the size of this fund—to provide for a board, but considered that the whole result could be accomplished by having the States submit their plans to the Department of Agriculture and having the proper officials there approve that plan and have it carried out under the direct supervision of the States, it seems to me that method can be followed here. And if the real plan is to stimulate the States and encourage them to submit a plan of vocational education to the approval of the Federal Government, that approval can be rendered by one official much more expeditiously and effectively than it could be done by a board. We did not find it necessary to create a board to administer the road law, and yet it apparently seems to be desired here to create a board to administer this law. With all due respect to the committee, it does seem to create unnecessary offices.

Nor can I understand why a bipartisan board should be necessary in this particular matter when it was not necessary in the case of the road law. Here is each State presumably with its own political policy and aspiration; it has to submit certain plans of education, and then those plans of education are to be passed upon and approved and cooperated in by the Federal Government. There does not seem to be in that anything requiring a bipartisan board.

But I can very easily understand—and this, I think, is the real evil to be avoided—that, if we create such a bipartisan board, in a few years it will not be limited in its total expenditures to \$200,000, but we will be the recipients of telegrams and letters and newspaper articles and other inspired literature demanding that we increase the amount available for that tremendous and important board of the Federal Government. Every board runs its tentacles—its roots—down into the social, industrial, and commercial bodies of the country, and the first thing you know we have got support from some source for that board. That does not always occur with a strictly administrative officer. It does seem to me that we can strengthen this bill very materially and add to its efficiency in many respects if we will dispense with the board. The board, after all, can agree upon only one plan of action. If they disagree we certainly have a source of weakness instead of a source of

strength. All the board can accomplish is to unite, to agree, upon a policy. It seems to me that policy can be carried out much more efficiently by one executive officer than by a board. I think the total result of section 6 as now drawn, and especially as amended by the amendment, which I voted against, to create classes out of which this board shall be selected—the total result is to weaken the section, and we will still more weaken it if we leave the board in existence at all. I think the board ought to be stricken out and the commissioner of education left in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment by way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were—ayes 10, noes 39.

Accordingly the amendment was disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 6 be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 703) to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, the trades, industries, and home economics; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to authorize the appropriation of money and to regulate its expenditure, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request:  
FLORENCE, S. C., January 2, 1917.

HON. CLAUDE KITCHIN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please secure five days' leave of absence and arrange pairs. I am in favor of probe.

J. W. RAGSDALE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this request will be granted.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KITCHIN, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

#### LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the vocational educational bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the vocational educational bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a similar request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting some remarks made on yesterday in Philadelphia by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] on Thirty Months of War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made yesterday by Dr. FESS at Philadelphia on Thirty Months of War. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the vocational educational bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the pending bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MINORITY VIEWS ON POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed two days in which to file minority views on the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for two days in which to file minority views on the Post Office appropriation bill (H. Rept. No. 1249, pt. 2). Is there objection?

There was no objection.



## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 3, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Navy Department who were paid out of appropriations contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1809); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Ashley River, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 1810); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1811); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the publications received and distributed by the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1812); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of the Merrimack River, Mass., from Lowell to the sea, and on preliminary examination of Merrimack River, from Lowell, Mass., to Manchester, N. H. (H. Doc. No. 1813); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a petition from a number of employees in the War Department occupying low-salaried positions asking for an increase in their compensation because of the high cost of living; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Evansville, Ind., requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Dubuque, Iowa, Steamboat-Inspection Service requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Apalachicola, Fla., Steamboat-Inspection Service, requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a petition from the employees in the office of the local inspectors at Galveston, Tex., Steamboat-Inspection Service, requesting an increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, transmitting lists of documents and files of papers which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1814); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of "tests of iron and steel and other materials for industrial purposes" made at that arsenal during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

13. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William Boughan, son and one of the heirs of William M. Boughan, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1815); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Emma R. Burlingame, widow of Andrew J. Burlingame, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1816); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sidney

E. Harrison, widow of Samuel H. Harrison, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1817); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Alonzo D. Hosmer *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1818); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. McDowell, widow of Cyrus D. McDowell, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1819); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John W. Yelton *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1820); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. Martin, widow (remarried) of Samson M. Archer, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1821); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Belle W. Morris, niece of John H. Benham, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1822); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary J. Camp, widow of Samuel C. Camp, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1823); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Kate C. Carey and Fannie C. Eldridge, daughters and sole heirs of Milton Carpenter, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1824); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William C. Cotton, son of Joseph Cotton, deceased, *v. The United States*; (H. Doc. No. 1825); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Cornelia Cress, widow of Edwin Cress, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1826); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Nancy P. Crosson, widow of Francis M. Crosson, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1827); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ella C. Daniels, widow of Charles Daniels, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1828); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lillian J. Hines and Frances D. Clark, nieces of Thomas Dean, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1829); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Matilda D. Edgerton, widow of William H. Edgerton, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1830); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary St. C. Ferguson, widow of William G. Ferguson, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1831); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Minerva Groom, widow of John C. Groom, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1832); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Maggie M. Deisch, formerly Maggie M. Guild, widow of George H. Guild, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1833); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary C. Griffin, widow of Daniel F. Griffin, deceased, *v. The*



United States (H. Doc. No. 1834); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of David Isaacs, Jane Davis, Phoebe Isaacs, and Julia Einstein, children and sole heirs of Lyon Isaacs, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1835); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frances J. Van Tuyle, widow (remarried) of Henry W. Jacobs, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1836); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

35. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph B. Presdee *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1837); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Orville T. Perkins *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1838); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

37. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Robert H. M. Donnelly *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1839); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

38. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George H. Devol *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1840); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

39. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Hattie Reaver and Ola Baird, daughters and sole heirs of Jacob E. Taylor, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1841); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

40. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Elizabeth A. Smith, widow of Thomas J. Smith, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1842); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary F. Silsbee, widow of Eri Silsbee, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1843); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

42. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Annie E. Perigo, widow of Ephraim Y. Perigo, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1844); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. Swelsfort, widow (remarried) of Benjamin M. Frank, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1845); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Albert Reynolds *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1846); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

45. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph Brinton *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1847); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

46. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John C. Bayless *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1848); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William H. Whitney *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1849); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Hannah C. Wainwright, widow of William A. Wainwright, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1850); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Cleveland Robinson, son of John C. Robinson, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1851); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

50. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lucius H. Ives *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1852); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Emma G. Harris, daughter of Henry Gephart, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1853); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frank Erdlemeyer *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1854); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Rowland J. Beatty *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1855); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Margaret G. Augustine, administratrix of Henry Augustine, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1856); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary A. Wiley, widow of Thomas C. Wiley, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1857); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Eliza J. Van Doren, widow of Archibald Van Doren, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1858); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frances D. Tenney, widow of Luman H. Tenney, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1859); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph H. Bigley, administrator of Charles C. Suydam, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1860); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Isora S. Cottrell, widow (remarried) of Gideon J. Stivers, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1861); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary S. Sheffield, widow of Eugene S. Sheffield, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1862); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Dwight L. Bathurst, administrator of Horace A. Russell, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1863); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Arthur C. Page, son of Francis M. Page, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1864); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George D. Millett, brother of John Millett, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1865); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary L. Martin, widow of Jeremiah C. Martin, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1866); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

65. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary L. Jennings, daughter of Benjamin F. Lee, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1867); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

66. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of C. T. Wathen, administrator of William H. Lawrence, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1868); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13311) granting a pension to Mrs. Dicie J. Sullivan, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOON: A bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 19411) providing for construction of bridges and culverts on public highways out of the reclamation fund when rendered necessary or appropriate by the construction of canals or laterals under the reclamation law; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 19412) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pomona, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 19413) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Wyoming National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19414) for the erection of a public building at the city of Auburn, State of California, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 19415) to remove restrictions against alienation and taxation on all lands in the Five Civilized Tribes immediately upon the death of the allottee; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 19416) to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Minidoka project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19417) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., pp. 539-560, chap. 389), relating to publications admitted to the second class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 19418) to promote the reclamation of arid and swamp lands of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19419) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19420) to authorize the President of the United States to advance officers on the retired list who were wounded in battle in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 19421) to authorize entry of the public lands by school districts for schoolhouse site and ground; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 19422) to prevent the use of the mails and of the telegraph and telephone in furtherance of fraudulent and harmful transactions on stock exchanges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19423) granting to the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, a right of way for a storm-water relief sewer through a portion of the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 19424) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892 (27 Stat. L., pp. 52-53); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 19425) to raise revenue by taxing certain articles of food held in cold storage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 19426) to amend an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19427) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the trustees of the Onawa Public Library, Onawa, Iowa, two condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 19428) to authorize the granting of a town-site patent to the town site of Petersburg, Alaska, and contiguous land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 19429) fixing interstate passenger rates in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19430) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for the filing with the Interstate Commerce Commission by telephone and telegraph companies of their rates, fares, and charges for the transmission of messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 19431) to provide standard time for the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 19432) for the relief of the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 19433) changing the designation, fixing the status of, and granting an increase of pay to clerks of the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A resolution (H. Res. 423) directing the Attorney General of the United States to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 424) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 425) directing the Secretary of War to transmit to the House certain information relating to the shipment of arms and munitions of war into Mexico, in violation of the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress, approved March 14, 1912, and the proclamation of the President issued in compliance therewith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A resolution (H. Res. 426) indorsing President's peace policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A resolution (H. Res. 427) amending the rules of the House by the creation of a committee on salaries of officers and employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 328) to investigate the charges made by Thomas W. Lawson against Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the United States, and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel V. Templin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19435) granting an increase of pension to John B. Mendenhall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19436) granting an increase of pension to William C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 19437) granting a pension to Susannah Ditterline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19438) granting an increase of pension to Zaphnath Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 19439) granting an increase of pension to Clark L. Stilwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19440) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19441) granting a pension to J. H. Kissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY: A bill (H. R. 19442) granting a pension to Mary A. Baker, widow of Fletcher D. Baker, Company B, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 19443) granting an increase of pension to David Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 19444) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. B. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19445) to waive the age limit and the disqualification of being married in the appointment of Edgar N. Caldwell as a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 19446) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smolen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 19447) for the relief of Ferdinand A. Roy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19448) granting an increase of pension to Philip P. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 19449) granting an increase of pension to Garrett W. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19450) granting an increase of pension to John Norfleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19451) granting an increase of pension to John Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 19452) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19453) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Yockey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19454) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 19455) granting a pension to Lilla J. Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 19456) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 19457) for the relief of T. M. Francis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 19458) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Trickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19459) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 19460) granting an increase of pension to Belle W. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19461) granting an increase of pension to Herman Brumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19462) granting an increase of pension to Morris Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 19463) granting an increase of pension to Eli Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19464) granting an increase of pension to William Winters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19465) granting an increase of pension to Theodore M. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19466) granting a pension to David Leroy Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19467) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19468) for the relief of Messrs. Palmer and McBryde; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLEY: A bill (H. R. 19469) granting a pension to Alvin Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19470) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bostwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19471) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19472) granting a pension to Francis G. Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 19473) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 19474) granting a pension to Joseph Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19475) granting a pension to William M. Helvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19476) for the relief of James Clay Colson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 19477) granting an increase of pension to Adolph van Reuth, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 19478) granting an increase of pension to Lou West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19479) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Brosius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19480) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Hulett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19481) granting a pension to Lewis Spriggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 19482) to provide a suitable medal for Charles P. Bragg; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 19483) granting an increase of pension to John A. Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19484) granting a pension to James R. Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 19485) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19486) granting a pension to Nellie Plew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 19487) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Bunyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 19488) granting an increase of pension to George Edward Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 19489) for the relief of Thomas Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19490) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Crews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 19491) granting an increase of pension to Josiah James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 19492) granting an increase of pension to Hobart Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 19493) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19494) granting a pension to Catherine R. Reader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19495) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19496) granting an increase of pension to William D. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19497) granting an increase of pension to William B. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19498) granting a pension to T. McElvaney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19499) granting a pension to Grant Gooch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 19500) granting a pension to Fred G. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 19501) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lingle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19502) granting an increase of pension to James H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 19503) granting a pension to George W. Sanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 19504) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 19505) granting an increase of pension to Louisa N. Tobey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 19506) granting a pension to Mary Glover; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19507) granting an increase of pension to De Foris Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 19508) granting an increase of pension to John U. Whitford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19509) granting an increase of pension to George M. Loring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 19510) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19511) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19512) granting an increase of pension to Luke P. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 19513) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Schriefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19514) granting a pension to Luda Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19515) granting a pension to Earl P. Ridgman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 19516) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Konicka; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19517) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Utter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19518) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19519) granting a pension to Henry S. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19520) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19521) granting a pension to Jennie Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19522) for the relief of S. Reamey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19523) for the relief of the legal representatives of Archer Hays, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19524) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Elrod; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19525) for the relief of the heirs of Lot Quinn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19526) for the relief of heirs of Nathan Pumphrey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19527) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennie Hunter, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19528) for the relief of Jennie Belle Cox, Robert Isaac Clegg, and Thomas Neel Clegg, children and only heirs of Thomas Watts Clegg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19529) granting an honorable discharge to Phillip Totten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19530) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Flanders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 19531) granting a pension to Americus Watt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19532) granting a pension to Angeline E. Nourse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 19533) to correct the military record of William J. Kerrigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 19534) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton L. Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19535) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ambrosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19536) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Jenkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19537) granting a pension to Lucia L. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19538) granting an increase of pension to Marvin J. Boughton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Red Polled Cattle Club of America, Gotham, Wis., protesting against proposed embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Kings County, N. Y., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 18069 for the special relief of Louisa Casy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Licking Lodge, No. 499, Loyal Order of Moose, of Newark, Ohio, against the increase of postage for periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of Fred Dethloff, W. H. Slatter, and many other residents of Marathon County, Wis., in favor of the Lindbergh resolution, No. 264; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of National Child Labor Committee, New York City, favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Board of Aldermen, New York City, protesting abolishment of pneumatic-tube mail system now in operation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Paragon Plaster Co., Syracuse, N. Y., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against passage of national prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lincoln Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring compulsory universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of G. O. Manley, New York City, favoring passage of House bill 15312; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, petition of Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees, Port Huron, Mich., protesting against increase of pound rate on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of sundry citizens, favoring increase for railway mail clerks and others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Petition of International Union of Brewery Workmen, of Schenectady, N. Y., against prohibition, of any character; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring embargo on exportation of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Loyal Order of Moose, of Gloversville, Amsterdam, and Johnstown, N. Y., against increase of postage on certain periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Christian Herald, New York City, protesting against proposed increase on second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of New York Photo Engravers' Union, No. 1; New York State Federation of Labor; International Typographical Union; Hardware Age; Central Federated Union; Christian Work; New York Freeman's Journal; Curtis Publishing Co.; Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees; and W. D. Boyce Co., protesting against proposed increase of the rate on periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' International Union of America, Local Union No. 132, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against passage of national prohibition law, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Child Labor Committee, New York City, favoring the passage of the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America and Central Federated Union, favoring increase of pay for Federal employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Boufort's Wine & Spirit Circular (Inc.), Louisville, Ky., favoring certain changes in the Randall bill prohibiting sending of periodicals with liquor advertisements through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ridgewood Board of Trade, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase in number of ways for Brooklyn Navy Yard in order that two ships may be built simultaneously; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of New York and the New York Board of Aldermen, against curtailment of pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Model License League, Louisville, Ky., protesting against passage of prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. K. Gleason, of New York City, and Lincoln Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of compulsory universal military training law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of American Bar Association, in favor of the passage of Senate bill 4551, vesting certain power in the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Middlesex-Essex Pomona Grange, No. 28, Everett, Mass., favoring embargo on wheat and



foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Texas: Petition of sundry firms and citizens of Dallas, Tex., in favor of bill for relief of Niagara Falls power situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cuero Commercial Club, of Cuero, Tex., and Texas Industrial Traffic League and sundry citizens and firms of Cuero, Tex., favoring passage of bill increasing the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENISON: Petition of certain letter carriers of Marion, Ill., for increased compensation for railway mail clerks and others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of sundry citizens against embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin Dairymen's Association favoring the passage of laws for reasonable national standards for all dairy products, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FESS: Papers to accompany House bill 19016, granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7059, granting an increase of pension to Philip H. Lind; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Rockford (Ill.) Merchants and Business Men's Association, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph Elson, of Northville, S. Dak., favoring House bill 18531, concerning proofs of widowhood in claim for pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of East St. Louis (Ill.) Commercial Club, favoring the continuation and extension of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Winnebago National Bank, of Rockford, Ill., favoring House bill 17606, amending Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the zone system and increase of postage rates for second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Brewer, of Ottawa, Ill., favoring House bill 13275, relative to military-bounty land warrants; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Evidence to accompany House bill 19020, for the relief of Mort Bradshaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of H. S. Speer, of Tinsman, and W. T. McKimon, of Wesson, Ark., for increase in pay of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 18941, granting increase of pension to Lydia Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of Sanitary and Reclamation Commission of Astoria, Oreg., asking for erection of modern post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Greenfield (Cal.) Grange, No. 357, indorsing Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of John W. Hays, president of Union Label Trades Department of American Federation of Labor, representing 720,000 workmen, protesting against all prohibition measures now pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Joseph Fessner, of St. Louis, Mo., secretary of the International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America, protesting, on behalf of 60,000 employees of the breweries of St. Louis, Mo., against the enactment of pending prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local No. 43, St. Louis, Mo., consisting of 650 members of the International Union of Brewery Workmen, filed by William Frech, secretary, urging the defeat of all prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, against high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of California Bean Dealers' Association, San Francisco, Cal., relative to the standardization of all food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of employees of the United States arsenal at Benicia, Cal., urging Congress to give consideration to the enactment of legislation for increasing the pay of civil-service employees generally and providing for the retirement of the aged and disabled employees in line with the trend of times; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Redding, Cal., urging embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of San Francisco (Cal.) Labor Council, favoring a national building in the San Francisco civic center; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Wholesalers' Board of Trade, opposing repeal of national-bankruptcy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of California Bean Dealers' Association, favoring standardization of all food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of employees of the post offices in Los Angeles and Pasadena, Cal., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of the city of New York, against autotruck service for mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of New York State Federation of Labor against increasing rates of postage on certain periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Pasco, Fla., favoring passage of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of W. F. Davis and other railway mail clerks of Amarillo, Tex., asking for increase of pay, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of employees of Laconia, N. H., post office, asking increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of J. F. Kelly, president Massachusetts Council, Friends of Irish Freedom, urging Congress to see that delegates of the United States to the proposed peace conference act as the champions of Irish freedom, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of C. O. Chadwick and other coal dealers of Newton, Mass., for the regulation of the price of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against proposed prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 3, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee in prayer because our confidence and hope is in Thy steadfastness. Thou dost not change. Thou dost not wait upon our willingness to follow. Thou hast led us by Thy hand in paths that we have not known, paths that lie beyond the reach of our thoughts and plans. Thou hast led us; Thou hast increased us in prosperity; Thou hast lavished upon us the blessings of the divine mind. We come before Thee to pray that Thou wouldst guide us this day in the discharge of our duties and lead us forward true to the great principles that we have committed ourselves to as a Nation, and loyal to the name of the God of our fathers. For Christ's sake. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bryan	Culberson	Gronna
Bankhead	Chamberlain	Cummins	Harding
Beckham	Chilton	Curtis	Hardwick
Brady	Clapp	Fletcher	Hitchcock
Brandegee	Clark	Gallinger	Hollis